



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 26, 2016

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: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice-Chair (arrived at 7:27 p.m.); Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission. Board member Amy Lloyd was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to explain the photograph on the overhead screen. Mr. Foust discussed some history about the Bishop & Lewis general store and meeting hall. The building was a dry goods store built in 1890. He said the second floor was designed to be a public meeting hall. The raised stage at the west end of the building is still there, but the surround was torn out approximately fifteen to twenty years ago. Mr. Foust said the building is the location of the Co-hatch application.

3. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. Unfinished**

- a. Sign - 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

## **Background & Request:**

*This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.*

**The original request to install a freestanding sign was heard at the last meeting, with discussion including concerns with need for a sign, size, placement and design. The applicant has now submitted a new design for the sign.**

## **Project Details:**

- 1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15' from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40' from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the canon.*
- 2. The sign would be non-illuminated.*
- 3. Proposed are ~~22~~<sup>13</sup> ½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly ~~40~~<sup>29</sup> square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.*
- 4. Black vinyl graphics are now proposed for use on the entire sign. The address continues to be shown in the pediment, but now would only identify the street number, "137". On the sign face, "Sharon Memorial Hall" would be at the top in 2 different sizes; and 3 tenants would be listed below in matching fonts and sizes. The proposed graphics appear to meet Code requirements.**
- 5. A 20" 16" high by 7'4" 6'6" wide base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped with aluminum painted gray is proposed.*

## **Land Use Plans:**

### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

*While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the "monument" type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting.*

*Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.*

#### Sign Code

*Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.*

*Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.*

#### **Staff Analysis:**

- 1. The concern expressed by residents and Board members about whether a sign should be approved at all is valid. The building is a prominent memorial; easily identified with a sign on the building and a gun in front; and is in a corridor which is largely residential. If a new sign is deemed appropriate, #2-4 below should be considered.**
- 2. The sign size has been reduced so the area is within Code requirements, and total height is under 7’.**
- 3. The design of the structure seems complimentary to the building. The inclusion of several tenants rather than just the building name seems inappropriate for this historic site.**
- 4. At least the building name should match the font and raised style of the lettering on the building. The other lettering style and sizes being the same would comply with the Code.**

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending that a freestanding sign may not be appropriate for the property. If the Board feels placement of a sign is warranted, the above changes should be considered.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Logan Dilts stated he is representing DaNite Sign Company, 1640 Harmon Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Jeremy Herman stated his address is 181 Rosslyn Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and he is the president of the veteran’s hall. He explained the veteran’s groups that operate at the hall do a lot for the community, so they would like the community to know they are there. Also, the current tenants financially support the hall. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 137 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-16, DATED MAY 16, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE FONT ON THE SIGN BE THE SAME AS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION OF THE BUILDING INCLUDING THE RAISED LETTERS.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Reis made the amendment. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, nay; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, nay. The motion was denied.

**2. New**

- a. Outdoor Seating Area – **5596 N. High St.** (David A. Creighton/Over the Counter) **AR 70-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts following from the staff memo:

**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. Last year Collage Salons opened in the northern part of the space formerly occupied by Colonial Music and Nicklaus Drugs. Also last year, the property was rezoned from C1 to C2 to allow a restaurant to the south. Approval of this request would allow an outdoor seating area for that restaurant.

**Project Details:**

1. The owner is proposing to open “Over the Counter” in the next couple of months.
2. The seating area would extend 19’ 11” from the building, and span the width of the storefront. Enclosure with a 3’ 4” high black iron fence is proposed, with gates near the building on the north and south sides.
3. A 3’ wide raised sidewalk is planned around the perimeter of the fence.
4. A site plan is needed showing the seating area in relation to the parking lot.
5. Table and chair styles were submitted by e-mail.
6. A variance is need for location of the seating area in the required front yard.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

The Worthington Design Guidelines recognize seating and tables for use by patrons makes the entire area feel more open and pedestrian-friendly. Also, traditional types of fences and walls, such as masonry walls and wrought iron fences are appropriate. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, if the site plan and furniture are appropriate. If the requested information is not received, the application should be tabled.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar said there was a letter received from St. Michael Church expressing concerns with noise because of nuns that live on the south side of the church site. Staff feels the building will be a barrier for the noise and that the majority of customers would park in front. The restaurant owner has given the church his number in case there are any problems. Staff feels there will not be a problem with noise from the patio area.

Mrs. Bitar pointed out the first parking space at the northwest corner of the lot needs to be eliminated as it is in the required setbacks and obstructs visibility. The area could be striped or landscaped. Also in that location are boxes with advertising pamphlets inside, and a sandwich board sign for the thrift shop. The sign was approved for location by variance, but would need to be moved back out of the right-of-way. The boxes are not allowed in the right-of-way or setback area, so would need to be moved up by the building or removed. Staff will pursue those items, but would like the space to be removed when the lot is re-striped.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Creighton stated his address is 3860 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio and was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar. Mr. Creighton said he is trying to do a first class job and stay within the laws. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Creighton what type of restaurant this would be and Mr. Creighton said the restaurant will be a classic American diner. Mrs. Holcombe asked what the hours of operation would be and Mr. Creighton said the restaurant will be opened from about 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Creighton would be serving dinner only and he said, yes, for now. He would like to have the restaurant opened for lunch and possibly breakfast too if the business does well. Mr. Reis said he was concerned about the traffic and if someone was not paying attention and the possibility of someone driving their car into the patio railing. Mr. Creighton said the western part of the patio will be near or at the end of the parking spaces. He believed the curb could be painted yellow or striped in a certain way. Mr. Creighton feels this added patio will have a calming effect on traffic.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Creighton what type of lighting would be used for the patio. Mr. Creighton said the existing florescent lighting in the area is so bright that he has no plans to add additional lighting. Mrs. Holcombe asked if alcohol can be served in this location and Mr. Creighton said yes. Mr. Reis asked Mr. Creighton if he would be using umbrellas on his tables and Mr. Creighton said he would like to preserve that option. Mr. Coulter explained he would have to come back to the board to have that discussion once he knows what he plans to use for the patio such as the materials and the colors. Mr. Brown explained to Mr. Creighton the umbrellas should be plain,

without graphics. Mr. Creighton said he understood. Mr. Foust asked if the building owner had any issues with breaking up the flow of the sidewalk and Mr. Creighton said no, he has not spoken with any of the other tenants, but the owner did not raise any objections. He said there is not much foot traffic that crosses the area. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Creighton if he was planning to raise up the surface to match the sidewalk and Mr. Creighton said yes, it is 4" to 7" high. Mr. Coulter asked if the fence will be painted black, and Mr. Creighton said yes, to match the arcade gate. The fence will be similar to what Natalie's restaurant has across the street, square, black and iron.

Mr. Myers asked if Mr. Creighton plans to have music on the patio (speakers), and Mr. Creighton said he had not thought of that idea, but he likes the concept. Mr. Myers said the Board has had some issues in the past with speakers and residents not liking the loud music. Mr. Creighton said there are no residences across the street, and because of normal traffic until later in the evening, people cannot even hear themselves talk. He will not be playing music to try to draw people in. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mrs. Bitar if Mr. Creighton will need to come back before the Board if he wants to have music speakers outside his restaurant. Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Creighton asked if that is because of visibility or due to volume. Mrs. Bitar said because of visibility. Mr. Creighton said he would try to have hidden speakers.

Mr. Coulter said, for the record, Mr. Sauer had just joined the group at 7:27 p.m. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Joe Kohler stated his address is 7072 Lansdowne St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kohler said he is representing St. Michael Church. He said an email was sent to Mrs. Bitar explaining that they do want to be good neighbors to the new business owner and his staff and wished them well. He said he is present at the meeting to raise their concern about possible noise coming from the business because the convent is two hundred and fifty feet from the front door of the new restaurant, and the front door of the church is two hundred and ninety feet from the restaurant. There are some nuns that teach at the school and live a semi-contemplative lifestyle and they would like to work with the owner to make sure the noise level is kept down.

Mr. Coulter said this new restaurant is being presented as an upscale diner versus some of the noise issues that Mr. Myers had talked about at another restaurant in town across the street.

Mr. Foust asked if employees could park in the lot at the south end of the property. Mr. Creighton said he thought they could. Mr. Foust worried that if the lot to the east was used, especially by employees who would leave later at night, there may be noise and headlights that could bother people across the street. He also expressed concern with the dumpster location in the east lot, and the potential for noise issues. He does not want to see another situation that causes noise in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hofmann asked the Board could make suggestions as to where to place the dumpsters. Mrs. Bitar explained this is not a Conditional Use Permit application. The Board is looking at the patio elements. She further explained if the Board feels the patio is not appropriate because of noise

concerns then the Board could address that. Mrs. Bitar said the property owner has expressed the willingness to have employees park on the south side, and with the majority of customers able to park in front because the other businesses in the center are mostly daytime uses, noise from late night traffic should be minimal. Also, the owner seems very willing to respond to any concerns that arise from his neighbors.

Mr. Creighton pointed out the east lot is full of cars in the aerial photograph, and Mrs. Bitar thought it was taken on a Sunday morning. Mr. Kohler said the parishioners have been told that parking lot is for use of the business tenants of the shopping center, and have asked them not to park in that location anymore, but cannot guarantee people are not parking there. Mr. Coulter asked if the parishioners use the parking lot across the street at the bank and Mr. Kohler said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID CREIGHTON ON BEHALF OF OVER THE COUNTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD AN OUTDOOR SEATING AREA AT 5596 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 70-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 70-16, DATED MAY 6, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT ONE PARKING SPACE BE REMOVED AT THE CORNER OF SELBY AND HIGH STREET, AND REPLACED WITH A PLANTING AREA (PREFERRED) OR STRIPED TO NOT ALLOW PARKING, AND THE BOXES AND SIGN WILL BE PURSUED BY THE CITY.**

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

- b. Projection Sign – **666 High St.** (Timothy Meacham/Meacham Real Estate Company) **AR 71-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This commercial building was constructed in 1964, with the first floor for shops and restaurants and the second floor for offices. This applicant has occupied one of the second floor offices for a number of years, installing a projection sign in 2012 for the business. The business name recently changed, and the owner is requesting approval for a change to the projection sign that reflects the new name.

**Project Details:**

1. Previously, the sign identified Rolls Realty and now the sign identifies the Meacham Real Estate Company. Colors are the same, having a black background, white lettering, and a blue logo.
2. Sign dimensions are 13.9” high x 33” wide, and the sign is made of Dibond, which is an aluminum composite material. The sign is suspended from a black metal bracket with scrolls.

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

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend signs be efficient (as small as necessary to get the business message across to the public) and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Traditional sign types most appropriate for Old Worthington include projecting, wall, awning and non-illuminated window signs. Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the new sign is similar to the previous sign, which was approved by the ARB.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar also pointed out the wall joint identification sign on the building which would also need approval and should be coming to the Board soon. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Timothy Meacham stated his address is 143 Lake Ridge Dr. Mr. Meacham apologized for not getting a permit to change the name on his business sign. He was unaware it was needed.

Mr. Sauer wanted to know the number of signs that are appropriate for a building, or at what point is adding signage inappropriate. Mrs. Bitar explained it is limited naturally by the Code, which allows signage base on building frontage. Mr. Sauer asked if it would appropriate for all of the second floor tenants to have a wall sign. Mrs. Bitar felt the reason for the directory sign was to identify those other businesses. She said if a business does not occupy frontage space, a sign could only be allowed by variance, so there is an extra level of review and signs are not guaranteed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone else present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:



**THAT THE REQUEST BY TIMOTHY MEACHAM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE PROJECTION SIGN AT 666 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 71-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 71-16, DATED MAY 6, 2016, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, nay; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

c. Window & Awning – **559 High St.** (Akbar Hadjarpour/Haddad Oriental Rugs) **AR 72-16**

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

This parcel has a commercial building (constructed in 1969) at the front and a single family home (constructed in 1930) at the rear, with split zoning to reflect those uses. The property owners purchased the property in 2012, moved their business, Haddad Oriental Rugs, into the commercial building near High St., and live in the house to the rear. Both buildings have been renovated, including new siding and roofing on the commercial building and a new garage was approved behind that has not yet been constructed. In 2012 there was also approval of a change to the signage, including a new awning and new sign faces for the existing freestanding sign.

The property owners decided to paint the existing awning instead of installing a new awning, so would now like approval for that work.

In March, a permit application was filed to replace the front windows. The contractor claimed the new windows would look just like the existing windows, so a permit was issued without ARB approval. Once installed, it was clear the new windows were different so the property owner is now asking for approval to keep the new windows.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The approved awning was to be a dark red fabric with 12” high letters saying “Haddad” in yellow, and “ORIENTAL RUGS” in white. The width of the lettering was to be about 14’. The size was approved to match the existing metal awning size. Rather than install a fabric awning, the owners painted the existing metal awning a matching dark red shade, and applied graphics. The following changes were made to the previously approved version: the text is larger; “Since 1974” was added to the top-middle; and a decorative line with curls was added around the outside edge.
2. The previous windows had 3 panes; the new windows have only 1 narrow pane adjacent to a larger pane of glass. The sash profile is also different.

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

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage, including the appropriateness of signage to the building, is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance. Fabric awnings are appropriate but should have a matte rather than a glossy surface. Use traditional flat, sloping awnings.

If windows are missing or must be replaced due to extensive deterioration, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible; wood windows are preferred.

**Recommendations:**

Reuse of the existing awning may be acceptable, but should have been approved that way. A more subtle use of graphics may be effective at this location.

The new windows do not match the previous windows, but do not harm the look of the building.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Hadjarpour if he had been sworn in yet and he said no. Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Hadjarpour of 559 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Hadjarpour why he did not follow the approved plans. Mr. Hadjarpour's daughter, Ms. Menijah Hadjarpour, stated her father misunderstood what was approved by the ARB Board. He thought the sign was supposed to look like the sign he had at his old location, so he painted the awning in that manner. Her would prefer to keep it, but would repaint the awning if necessary.

Coulter asked about the windows and Ms. Hadjarpour explained that Rosati Windows told her father that they got the approval, because they were already aware that they needed approval from the ARB. After the windows were installed they received a letter stating they needed ARB approval but Rosati Windows insisted they did receive the approval so there was a misunderstanding. Her father wanted the windows designed with a picture window to display the rugs, and the ability to open the windows. Mr. Reis asked Ms. Hadjarpour if they knew that Rosati was installing the windows in this design, and she said yes. Ms. Hadjarpour said they were aware that approval was needed but Rosati Windows insisted that approval was already obtained.

Mrs. Holcombe expressed concern with not installing the awning/sign as was approved, and felt the owners should have gotten approval for the window change before the contractor applied for the permit.

Mr. Hofmann said the single pane window is not a concern, but what does bother him is that the windows are a bright white vinyl on a whole lot of other colors and some other things going on with the building façade. He feels the store front is not very presentable. Mr. Hofmann asked the Hadjarpours if they were amenable to painting the trim around the windows and the door to match

the brown or some other color that would help tone down the glare of the bright white. Mr. Hofmann said he is not particularly concerned with the fabric awning but he does believe the size of the sign should be corrected. Mr. Coulter clarified that what Mr. Hofmann was saying was that the windows could be approved as installed, but the Board may ask if the white window trim can be painted a different color. Mr. Coulter said he could live with the metal canopy but he agrees with Mrs. Holcombe the sign needs to be painted to match what was approved. Ms. Hadjarpour said she understood.

Mr. Sauer said he prefers the previous windows instead of the new windows, but he understands why they would like a picture window in order to display the rugs. Mr. Sauer said he also does not mind the white trim because there is other white trim on the window as well, and painting all of that area brown, would make the building look too blah, and too dark. He said if you look at the house behind the business the house has a combination of brown and white also. Mr. Sauer said he agrees that the sign should be redone. He understands the awning is metal and painted.

Ms. Hadjarpour asked if they could just change the sign and leave the trim around the windows, and then let the Board decide at that time if the color around the sign should change as Mr. Hofmann suggested. Mr. Sauer said he would be amenable to that. Mr. Hofmann said he struggles with the project. Mr. Foust said he does also. Mr. Hofmann said the window color does not need to be brown, just some color to tone down the brightness of the white. Mr. Foust said he believes the sign should be changed to match the originally approved graphics, and that the windows can remain, and the trim should be painted a color a tone of something between brown and white and chosen by a professional that can coordinate with all of the colors. He said he does not like brown for them, but feels white would be glaring. Mr. Foust said he feels that the windows are an improvement.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY AKBAR HADJARPOUR FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN THE EXISTING METAL AWNING AND WINDOWS AT 559 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 72-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 72-16, DATED MAY 12, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:**

- That the signage will be repainted to reflect the original approved signage for the building;
- That the windows in their current configuration will be retained, and not replaced;
- After the sign is replaced, the applicant will return to the Board with a color palette for possibly repainting the window and door frames within thirty days of the sign being replaced.

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

d. Fence – **600 High St.** (Shawn McNeil/Worthington United Methodist Church) **AR 73-16**

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

The original part of the Worthington United Methodist Church was built in 1926, and additions were constructed over the years. A parking lot is south and east of the church, with access from High St., E. New England Ave. and Hartford St. An agreement is in place with the City to use the lot for public as well as church parking.

The northern parcel containing parking and part of the access drive from E. New England Ave. is adjacent to the rear of 2 residential properties that face Hartford St. (615 & 617). A fence is now proposed to separate the properties. A third residential property south of the others is owned by the church, and has part of the parking lot and a dumpster on the rear. Fencing is proposed to screen 3 sides of the dumpster.

#### **Project Details:**

1. About 20' of that 52' wide parcel has been used by those property owners as part of the back yards for many years. The fence would be erected on the property line between the church's property and the residential properties, reclaiming that 20' as church property. The fence would be adjacent to parallel parking and the access drive. The fence would also run on the south side 615 Hartford St. to screen parking at the rear of the lot. A shed at the rear of 617 Hartford St. would need to be moved out of the way of the fence.
2. The proposed fence is 6' high and solid, in the same style as was erected by the City on the north side of the W. New England Ave. parking lot. The fence looks the same on both sides. Dead and diseased trees and weeds would be removed from the area, and good trees would be saved.
3. Matching fencing would screen the north, east and south sides of the dumpster.

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

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

Screen parking with landscaping such as low bushes; historically and architecturally appropriate low fences or walls may also be effective. Fencing should be constructed with traditional materials and appropriate for the site. Preferred are fences that are open in style and 3' - 4' in height. Higher fences are discouraged, but may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property. Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences. Keep functional items such as trash containers, transformers and electrical boxes orderly and well screened.

#### **Recommendation:**

Page 12 of 20

ARB/MPC Meeting May 26, 2016

Minutes

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the proposed fence style is appropriate for screening of parking areas and dumpsters.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Shawn McNeil stated his address is 370 Charleston Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. McNeil said the church would like to screen the neighboring properties and clean up the area a little bit. Mr. Coulter asked if the fence would stay in the natural color and Mr. McNeil said yes, the fence will be made out of pressure treated natural wood.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Alan Proctor stated his address is 471 Highgate Ave., Worthington, Ohio, and that he is representing the Worthington United Methodist Church. Mr. Proctor said the church has executed a parking lease with the city for the next ten years. For the past three years the church has been talking with all of the neighbors. The fence will create a barrier for the residents, and all three neighboring properties are in favor of the fence. Mr. Proctor said they will make sure the fence is exactly the same as the fence that was built for the other city parking lot.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SHAWN MCNEIL ON BEHALF OF WORTHINGTON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ERECT FENCING AT 600 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 73-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 73-16, DATED MAY 13, 2016, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- e. Patio with Seat Walls and Fire Pit; Landscaping – **111 W. Clearview Ave.** (Scott & Amy Fulton) **AR 74-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This house was originally constructed in 1963 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The front porch was added in 2012. The homeowners would like to replace the rear patio, and add seat walls and a fire pit.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed patio would be approximately 250 square feet, and in the shape of a peanut. Construction would be of pavers with variegated colors (Toffee/Onyx/Mauve), and include 22" high curved seat walls at the east and west edges. A fire pit is proposed on the east side.
2. A variety of plant materials are proposed around the patio, including a Sweet Bay Magnolia, Arborvitae, Hydrangea and Hosta.
3. Work shown on the site plan for the front and sides of the house is not part of this proposal.

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

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed landscape and hardscape elements are compatible with the house and property.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Scott Fulton stated his address is 111 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust asked Mrs. Bitar if the applicant is before the Board due to the elevation of the walls and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Fulton to discuss the walls. Mr. Fulton said the property slopes from the east to the west, so there is a slight change in the elevation. The wall to the east will be slightly lower than the wall to the west. Mr. Fulton mentioned the existing patio is deteriorating. Mr. Fulton passed around material samples to the Board members.

Mr. Myers said the city has been hearing concerns about fire pits around town and he believes that there are a lot of people around town that do not know how to burn wood. Mr. Myers said there is a lot of green wood, wet wood, and leaves and smoke and when you build a fire pit without a chimney, and you have prevailing winds from the west blowing into the fire pit in a neighborhood that is fairly tight the smoke will go right into the neighbor's back yard. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Fulton if his fire pit will be level with the ground because he is hoping the knee wall will act as a chimney. Mr. Sean Stauffer stated his address is 13110 Hatch Rd., Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Stauffer stated the seat wall is generally six rows total, which is about twenty-one inches. He said most of the fire pit walls are a maximum of three rows high. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Stauffer if the pit will be sunken into the ground and Mr. Stauffer said the pit will actually be a little lower than the surface of the ground. Mr. Stauffer said unfortunately, if you dig a hole and put the wood deep inside you will not feel the warmth of the fire. The flames need to be above the concrete façade in order to feel the warmth. Mr. Myers said he would appreciate anything Mr. Stauffer can do to make sure the neighbors will not have to deal with smoke issues in their back yards, or open windows. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCOTT AND AMY FULTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW PATIO WITH SEAT WALLS AND A FIRE PIT, AND LANDSCAPING AT 111 W. CLEARVIEW AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 74-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 74-16, DATED MAY 13, 2016, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

f. Signage – **659 High St.** (Matthew Davis/COHatch Worthington LLC) **AR 75-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This building was originally constructed in 1875 and remodeled in the late 1900's. Much of the building was home to Worthington Hardware for many years. In 2015, the building owners decided to split up the hardware store space, and have leased out the building to separate tenants. The current tenants in this building include: Sassafra Bakery, Grid Furnishings, Igloo Letterpress, SNAP Fitness and the Old Bag of Nails. A Conditional Use Permit was approved for the second floor space at the south end of the building to be occupied by COHatch for use as office space, and the ARB approved modifications to the building. This application is for signage.

**Project Details:**

1. A wall sign and a projection sign are proposed with this application.
2. The 4'8" high x 4'6" wide (21 square foot in area) wall sign would be between the second floor windows on the front of the building. The sign would be made of individual letters in 3 sizes: "CO" is largest; "HATCH" is smaller; and "MEET SHARE LIVE" is smallest. The lettering was originally proposed in green, extending above the windows, with illumination from below with a small fixture. Discussion with staff led to other options, including lowering the sign, potential use of a gooseneck, and in a brown stain. The material is proposed to be wood, or a composite to look like wood.
3. A small circular projection sign is also proposed with the same lettering style.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend signs be efficient (as small as necessary to get the business message across to the public) and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Traditional sign types most appropriate for Old Worthington include projecting, wall, awning and non-illuminated window signs. Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Staff Analysis:**

1. The font of the larger letters is not traditional, but is part of the business logo.
2. Stained wood may be more appropriate than green for the graphics. The projection sign should be constructed of the same material, and include texture if possible.
3. Illumination should be subtle, and may not be best accomplished with a gooseneck fixture.
4. Location of the wall sign may be more appropriate centered on, or lining up with the lower part of the windows.

**Recommendation:**

Although second floor signage is not typical in Old Worthington, it may be appropriate in this location where the business will occupy the entire second floor, and has no first floor presence. The ARB should discuss the different elements of this application, and decide on the best combination based on the above analysis.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Davis. Mr. Matthew Davis stated his address is 4620 Hickory Rock Dr., Powell, Ohio. High St. Mr. Davis said he developed COHatch while he was working on the Snap Fitness project. He walked up to the second floor of the building with the Zettler family, and saw four thousand square feet of space. He said he was envisioning what he could do with that space. Mr. Davis said he talked with his partner and was trying to think of a nonprofit that could help the community. He said he started learning about co-working spaces and they came up with a concept of putting shared office spaces, book meeting rooms and co-working spaces with your telephone, and he has an innovation lab. Their goal is to bring in big companies to be able to use the space, and have lunch and enjoy Worthington. Mr. Davis said they put their Facebook page together eight days ago and have already had an amazing amount of inquiries. He said this concept will need to fit well with the community. Mr. Davis said he has already spoken with the Chamber of Commerce, and he also plans to attend the Worthington Farmer's Market, and have discussions with other various local civic organizations.

Mr. Davis said he is concerned the space is on the second floor and people are not aware of the shared working space concept. He said he would discuss what shared working space is on their social media page, but having no door or signage would hurt his business dramatically. Mr. Davis said he plans to work on his brand and open up other offices around the outer belt so people will not have to drive all the way to downtown Columbus. That way people can stop in and work in



small communities. He said his company was founded on three fundamental principles: Enjoy where you work and who you work with; take care of yourself (everyone will get a free membership to the gym); and live in and take care of your community. Five percent of the revenue will go to support local charities in Worthington, and the people that work there can decide where the money will go. Mr. Davis asked the Board for their help so he can make this concept work.

Mr. Davis said he likes the color green for the sign because the color is vibrant and he also likes the look of the wood. Mr. Davis said he wants to have a light because people are not used to seeing a second story sign and the tree would block the view of the sign. He plans to open up the office this coming August or September. Mr. Coulter said he likes the concept and his preference is the wooden sign. He believes the look is more in character with what they are trying to establish downtown. Mr. Coulter said he could probably go either way with the lighting, but he liked the light beam from below versus the gooseneck lamp. He would prefer the blade sign somewhat matches the wooden sign.

Mr. Reis said he applauds Mr. Davis's concept, and thinks this will be great for downtown Worthington. Mr. Reis specified he preferred the logo shown for the print material to be used for the building sign. He felt that version of the sign could be a bit smaller and fit between the windows. Mr. Hofmann said he likes the idea of the wood sign and believes the gooseneck would fit better in Old Worthington than the beaming light from below. Bringing the sign lower will help from a visual standpoint.

Mr. Sauer said the gooseneck light shown in the drawing looks oversized. Mr. Davis said the reason he picked out the gooseneck lamp is because it matches the fixtures used for Snap Fitness and Vernacular. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the gooseneck lamp because of the consistency throughout the downtown. Mr. Davis said he has heard from Snap Fitness customers that the wood sign is hard to read. Mr. Hofmann thought the proposed sign would be easier to read in the wood color due to the design. Mr. Davis thought maybe the tag line could be green. Mrs. Holcombe liked the green, but not in relation to the Igloo storefront. Mr. Davis wished the Igloo storefront could be white again. Mr. Sauer said he likes the proposed color and the logo for the sign, thinking the green would add spice to the downtown. Mr. Davis would like to have the letters in green so people can read the sign, and feels the green keeps it from being a boring, stuffy office.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Davis about the window sign for the store downstairs (Grid) and Mr. Davis explained he spoke with the owner about two months ago and the owner is not intending to put up a sign. Mr. Davis would have liked to use the sign band above Grid. Mr. Davis said the way the system works, when you are a member, you will have access to the front of the building and but would most likely use the side door as your entrance. He said he would like to figure out how to mark the side door. Mrs. Bitar said a variance would be needed for an additional exterior sign, but the sign could also be put inside the glass front window.

Mr. Davis said he does not have a sample of the green color yet. Mr. Sauer asked if all the signage downtown should look like before 1920's signs. Mr. Hofmann said there should be a juxtaposition with the new, so he does not mind the more modern sign color with the traditional gooseneck lamp.

Mr. Myers explained that there is a lot of pressure to fit within the Design Guidelines, and there is a possibility that maybe the Design Guidelines should be re-looked at and made stricter. Mrs. Holcombe stated those are just guidelines and not rules, and Mr. Myers agreed that is the argument. He said every point has been made about moving forward while paying tribute to the past. He is not sure how you strike that balance. Stricter guidelines will just make moving forward more difficult.

Mrs. Holcombe said she had a suggestion. All of the Board members do not agree with the color of the sign, but they all agree with the wood. She said she came into the meeting not wanting the sign on the building at all, but she likes the concept of the business. Maybe approval of the wood colored sign could move forward, and then over time Mr. Davis could come back to the Board to change the color.

Mr. Davis said he will do whatever the Board will agree to, but would prefer to not have to change colors. He said his view of paying homage to the old is there is a little too much focus on signage and not as much about the architectural details. He said, for example, with the inside of Snap Fitness, he tried to pay as much homage as he could to that building and the building looks awesome on the inside. The building looks a little bit modern, a little bit new, but he is investing a ton of money on the inside of this building to make the building look old and new. He is keeping the outside traditional white like the building was meant to be. Mr. Davis said all he is asking for is a small bit of green on the sign to say this is new. He will keep the gooseneck lamp to be consistent with the other gooseneck fixtures in the area.

Mr. Reis said he does not have a problem with the green, but wanted to go back to his original comment about the logo. He believes the sign should be a little bit smaller and a little less poignant. He does not think the sign will be very visible in the summer. Mr. Reis said he likes the gooseneck lamp. Mr. Davis said the sign was designed to be symmetrical, and he does not feel he can change the design.

Mr. Sauer said what bothers him is the position of the Grid sign and the color of the Igloo.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Robert Hale McKirnan stated his address is 251 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. McKirnan said he agrees with Mr. Sauer, if Igloo did not look that way, this agenda item would not have taken as long to discuss. He believes that Igloo clashes with the colors of the business next door.

**Motion:**

Mr. Sauer moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MATTHEW DAVIS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNS AT 659 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 75-**

**16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 75-16, DATED MAY 13, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT:**

- That the COHatch sign represented as option number two, lowered with the gooseneck fixture above;
- That there will be a pendant sign on the side of the building;
- That the color of the sign on the building and the blade sign will be similar to either the color black like Vernacular or the natural wood of Snap (but matching each other);
- That the gooseneck light will be identical to those above the Snap and Vernacular sign.

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

g. Addition – **251 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Robert Hale McKirnan) **AR 76-16** (Amendment to AR 41-16)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This house was constructed in 1961 and is a bi-level design, with aluminum siding and a block rear foundation painted white. In 1998 a deck was added across the rear of the house at the upper level. Aluminum windows were replaced with vinyl windows in 2011.

A rear room addition was approved by the ARB in March. This request would modify the previous proposal.

**Project Details:**

1. *The addition would be roughly 19' wide x 20' deep (± 358 square feet), requiring removal of part of the existing deck. A 13' wide area would act as a connector from the existing house to the addition. The 3' 8" wide space would have a window on the east side, and a door on the west side to provide access to the deck.*
2. *Windows are proposed on all 3 sides of the addition, including a large picture window to the rear, and would be vinyl to match the house.*
3. **Before, the addition was proposed to step down from the existing rear of the house. Now, the addition would be at the same elevation as the house, with the eave tying into the house eave.**
4. **The concrete block foundation would now consist of full walls, creating an enclosed structure. A door is proposed on the west side. It is not clear if the proposed block color would still be tan. White aluminum siding to match the existing house is proposed above.**
5. *The proposed roof has a low pitched gable, and would have shingles to match the house.*

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

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

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed modifications are appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant. Mr. Robert Hale McKirnan stated his address is 251 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. McKirnan said the reason for the change is because the addition needed to be enclosed to run wires, HVAC, water and things of that nature. He said a new roof design was needed to match. Mr. Sauer said it will simplify construction. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT HALE MCKIRNAN TO AMEND THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 41-16 WITH CHANGES TO THE ADDITION AT 251 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 76-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 76-16, DATED MAY 16, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

There was no business to discuss.

**D. Other**

There was no business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.