



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
September 22, 2016

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to 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. Commission member Edwin Hofmann was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the September 8, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

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

B. Architectural Review Board

Mr. Foust displayed an invitation to the 25th Anniversary of The Children's Home of the Ohio Annual Conference in 1936. He said the building was originally built in 1911.

1. Unfinished

- a. Sign – 693 ½ High St., Suite E (College Bound Advantage) AR 104-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in the early 20th century and has mainly housed retail on the first floor, with a mix of personal services and office on the second floor. The upstairs spaces at 693 ½ have housed a number of users, many of whom have had signage at the first floor level by the entry door. A Conditional Use Permit was granted in June of this year to allow offices on the second floor of this building.

This applicant is proposing location of a wall sign by the north entrance to the upstairs space.

Project Details:

1. The 10” x 22” wall sign is proposed east of the blue door next to the Wren House, and below the Bridges Counseling sign. A sign was approved for Kasa Yoga above the Bridges Counseling sign at the last meeting.
2. The new sign would be constructed of sandblasted HDU, and would identify the business name, “College Bound Advantage” as part of the circular logo in the middle of the sign. The proposed sign would have a white background and include green, beige and black raised elements.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the proposed sign. The material will look like wood, and be in character with the building and Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present and no one came forward. Mrs. Bitar suggested the Board move forward with taking a vote if they did not have further questions. 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 COLLEGE BOUND ADVANTAGE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL SIGN AT 693 ½ HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 104-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 104-16, DATED AUGUST 23, 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; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. New

- a. Directional Signage – **6851 N. High St.** (Morrison Sign Co./Telhio Credit Union) **AR 112-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar said the applicant has requested to table this item. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye.” The application was tabled.

- b. Windows, Trim, Gutters, Front Entry – **347 E. Granville Rd.** (Dan LaMacchia) **AR 113-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The owner indicates the original portion of this building was moved to this lot in 1860, and had been a structure used by a commercial operation. By 1872, the conveyance value and plat map definitely show a structure was on the site. So although shown as being constructed in 1925 on the Franklin County Auditor’s website, historical records indicate construction of the house was in the 1800’s. Placement on the site was always 2’ into the Andover St. right-of-way, so City Council granted an easement in 1986 for the house to stay in its location. The house was never identifiable as a particular architectural style.

More recent records included the addition of a ½ bath and utility room in 1973, and then removal of the rear additions and construction of a much larger two-story addition in the 1980’s by the current owners. At that time, the owner had hoped to give the house the look of a Federal Style structure, being approved to add eave and window trim and a new entrance, but never finished the work.

This application is a request to replace the windows and front door; add trim to the windows, eaves and front entry; and re-paint the entire house. Recently, the rear of the garage was used to experiment with trim elements. Photographs of those elements have been provided to demonstrate the desired look.

Project Details:

1. Windows:

Replacement of all of the windows with aluminum clad Andersen E-Series simulated divided light windows is proposed. The exterior color would be green to match the existing and proposed trim color. Sizes of openings are not proposed to change, but the number of lights in each window would change. The existing first floor windows are mostly 12 over

12 lights, and would be replaced with 9 over 9 lights. The second floor windows have an 8 over 8 pattern, and would be replaced with 6 over 6. Existing windows that have the bottom blocked off would be replaced with the same size windows with 6 over 6, and the wood panels would be replaced with new wood painted green. Photographs of the existing windows as well as a proposed window sample have been submitted. The dimensions of the lights in the sample window do not reflect what is proposed. There are not drawings of the house, although a front elevation is expected before the meeting.

Molding is proposed across the top of the windows that would be Ekena Polyurethane. Photographs of the general look from the rear of the garage are included. Other window trim would be PVC, and all trim would be painted the same shade of green as the existing trim and the new window sashes.

2. House:

Replacement is proposed for the corner boards, friezes and rakes with a PVC product. Examples of the look are shown in the photos from the rear of the garage. Gable returns of the same material are also proposed. All elements would be painted the same shade of green.

Elliptical vents that were in the north and southeast gable appear to have been replaced with solid wood, and are not proposed to change.

The entire house is proposed to be painted the same shade as it is currently. The records show Griffin House Ivory and Ludwell Tenement Sage as the colors proposed with the addition in the 1980's.

3. Front Entry:

Replacement of the front door as well as the addition of trim is proposed. The door would be an Anderson Wood Door with sidelights and an elliptical window above. A photograph of an entrance is included as an example. The actual form may be less of a roof structure and more of a trim element around the door. A combination of wood and composite materials would be used. The existing entrance consists of a paneled door with two small lights at the top and sidelights. In addition to the elliptical window proposed above, the new door would have glass openings in the top two-thirds of the door with sidelights to match. The elliptical window in the example has a detailed pattern. No mention has been made of a change to the existing brick stoop with railing that extends from the front door to steps near the east side of the house. A front elevation of the house was presented at the meeting.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Federal style is known for its formality, symmetry and the use of classical detailing. Typical character-defining features include: gabled or hipped rooflines; beveled siding with corner boards; entrances with sidelights; entrances with semi-elliptical fanlights or rectangular transoms; multiple-paned 12 over 12, 9 over 9 or 6 over 6 windows; multiple-panel wood doors; and classical detailing.

Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. If historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the-glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important. Avoid treatments to “dress up” a door or entrance, giving it a character it never had.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the proposed modifications once the ARB feels comfortable with the details. Although the changes would give a different look to the building, modifications based on an architectural style found in Worthington may be appropriate. The existing structure has been modified significantly over the years and did not have a distinctive style in the beginning. Achieving the symmetry of a Federal style structure would be difficult, but the addition of more formal detailing could improve the look of this structure. The pattern in the elliptical window seems out of character with the other proposed trim elements. Also, staff is a little concerned with the addition of materials that are not natural, as they have a different (more perfect) look than wood. The addition of flat paint to those materials, however, would likely help them blend with the existing house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dan LaMacchia stated his address is 347 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter said the sample windows in the photograph had a tall sill and he wanted to know if that was what is being proposed. Mr. LaMacchia that is the style of the window he intends to use but the sill will not look so pronounced once the windows are installed. Mr. LaMacchia said the first floor windows are six feet tall, and the example is only three feet tall. He said this window is the only aluminum clad window that Andersen offers, and that is what is currently in the house now. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. LaMacchia how long the pergola has been in place on the back and Mr. LaMacchia said since about 1990. The pergola will be painted the same color as the trim on the house.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. LaMacchia if he knew the history of the house. Mr. LaMacchia said in 1840 the house used to be the Grist Mill at the end of Andover Street in Rush Creek. Sometime between 1840 and 1860 the house was moved to E. Granville Rd. He said he began renovating the house in the 1980's. Over the years Mr. LaMacchia said he has put four additions on the house. The house was originally about eighteen hundred square feet and the house now is almost four thousand square feet. Mr. Foust said he liked what has been done to preserve the house. Mr. LaMacchia said at some point the porch will need to be replaced because the brick is starting to flake and the mortar is beginning to crumble. He would like to get the forty-two windows and trim replaced this year, and come back later to discuss the rest of the project, including the front entry element. 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 DAN LAMACCHIA FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE WINDOWS, FRONT ENTRANCE, AND TRIM AT 347 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 113-16, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 113-16, DATED AUGUST 8, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye.

c. New Medical Office Building – **1033 High St.** (United Methodist Children’s Home) **AR 114-16**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. New Medical Office Building - **1033 High St.** (United Methodist Children’s Home) **ADP 06-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The United Methodist Children’s Home (UMCH) site is approximately 41 acres in size, with existing buildings (occupied and vacant), parking and driveways. The majority of the property is zoned S-1, Special, except in 1987 just under 10 acres of land along the High St. frontage was rezoned to C-3, Institutions and Offices (~9.2 acres) and C-2, Community Shopping Center (~0.6 acres). Since the Comprehensive Plan was updated in 2005 and included a strategic redevelopment plan for the site, City leaders have anticipated a redevelopment that included a mix of uses across the entire site. The City studied the property again in 2014 and adopted amendments to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, refining the desired outcome for the property.

These applications are a request for approval to build a two-story medical office building along the High St. frontage. The building would house an OhioHealth emergency room on the first floor, and medical offices on the second floor. The existing buildings and much of the parking on the UMCH site would not be impacted.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan:

- Location of the two-story 20,000 square foot building would be about 48' west of High St. (24' from right-of-way line) and about 375' north of Wesley Blvd.
- A new one-way drive from Wesley Blvd., starting about 60' west of High St. and curving to the north is proposed to connect to the southeast corner of the parking lot, which is approximately the same location as the existing parking. The connection would run between the new building and the existing building housing the West Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church office (two-stories, 25,000 square feet). The existing drive west on Wesley Blvd. would provide access at the west side of the parking lot. Existing parking would be repositioned and new parking would be added near the existing lot entrance to the west, and south and north of the new building to accommodate both buildings. The proposed parking count would be 180 spaces, which allows 4 spaces per 1000 square feet of building space, meeting the Code requirement. The parking area to the north is proposed to line up with the east face of the new building, and would extend to about 150' north of the building.
- Drop-off lanes for the emergency room and medical offices are proposed adjacent to the back of the building.
- A transformer, generator and dumpster enclosure are shown between the north wall of the building and the parking area.
- The retention of as many trees as possible should be considered as part of the development, particularly the healthy trees near High St.
- Acceptable plans for landscaping, screening, lighting, storm water management and traffic would be expected before approval of the applications would be granted.
- Variances would be needed for the placement of a building and parking in the required High St. front yard, which is 100' for buildings and 50' for parking.

2. Building:

- The two-story 20,000 square foot building would be approximately 143' x 74', with the longer side of the building parallel with High St. The building has the look of 3 sections on the front, but it is not clear if there is an offset or just architectural detail dividing the building. On the roof of the center section, a white parapet wall is proposed that could act as an equipment screen. The largely brick building is designed with storefront style windows on the first floor and smaller windows of the second floor.
- The entrances to the building would be on the west side, adjacent to the parking lot. At the south end, an atrium type look is proposed for the emergency room entrance. The façade would be mostly glass windows with white framing and trim. Flat-roofed canopies supported by stone columns are proposed above the emergency room entrance and office entrance at the north end of the building.
- Only renderings are included with the applications. Building elevations; window, door and lighting details; and material samples would be needed for approval.

3. Signage:

- Although signage is not yet proposed, the applicant has indicated the desire to have signage on both sides of the building. Variances will likely be requested.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identified the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines. The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City. The UMCH property was specifically addressed in that section of the plan, with concepts establish for mixed use development on the site.

The following objectives were established in the 2014 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Consideration of the redevelopment potential of this site (UMCH) recognizing the critical resource and opportunity this 40+ acre site represents within the City.
2. Provision of a mix of desirable uses and green space that are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and are currently underserved in Worthington.
3. Addressing the needs of current and future residents by providing new housing types/options that are underrepresented in the market and complement Worthington's current offerings.
4. Recognition of the financial goals of UMCH to enable it to continue its mission within the region.
5. Expansion of the City of Worthington's tax base by incorporating uses that allow for new or enhanced sources of revenue.
6. Preservation and integration of the existing natural features found on the site related to Tucker Creek.
7. Creation of a well-planned, vibrant, walkable, and integrated development of the highest quality that meets or exceeds current best practices for mixed use development, including the provision of communal space and complete streets.

The High Street Mixed Use zone is described in the 2014 document as follows:

North High Street is the commercial spine of the City of Worthington and is a good location for commercial office use. Income tax generating employment uses such as office are critical to the fiscal sustainability of the City. In addition, this site's close proximity to historic Old Worthington makes it a prime location for walkable residential development and denser, amenity-rich housing types. This location along High Street is attractive for retail and service uses as well. It is not the desire of the City, however, to create a third retail center in close proximity to Old Worthington and the Shops at Worthington Place. Retail in this location should be neighborhood scale and serve the development that occurs on this site and that exists in the surrounding neighborhood; and it should help to activate the High Street frontage.

The High Street Mixed Use zone consists of the frontage of the UMCH site along High Street. It recommends a mix of office, residential, and retail uses with the focus on commercial office and medical uses with subordinate residential and limited retail uses. Buildings in this zone should be a minimum of two stories and a maximum of five stories in height with attractive, four-sided architecture. Buildings in this zone should address the streets, activate the street frontage, and

include opportunities for outdoor dining and other pedestrian-focused activities. It is expected that the buildings adjacent to High Street will be commercial offices. Residential uses might occur behind as a transition to the Neighborhood Core. Neighborhood-oriented retail uses can complement the development in the first floors of office and residential buildings.

The objective of the High Street Mixed Use zone is to create a high-quality, dense, walkable, connected, mixed-use development that creates a dynamic space and signature address to attract Class A office tenants along High Street and add vitality and life to the High Street corridor. In order to create a walkable environment, it is expected that buildings will line public streets and most parking will be located at the center of blocks, screened from public streets by attractive buildings. Parking beneath buildings may also be considered, provided the public street frontage of a building is activated. By providing a mix of uses within the High Street Mixed Use zone, parking areas can be shared to optimize their use. To achieve the desired densities, parking decks are encouraged to be integrated into the site. Features expected as part of any parking deck or structure include masonry and architectural elements to dress up the exterior, windowed stair towers, and lush landscaping and pedestrian connections. Parking structures and/or parking lots could be lined with residential and/or retail development to separate and screen them from the Neighborhood Core.

Where the High Street Mixed Use zone is opposite existing single-family residential development, it is expected that the new development will consist of residential development and/or substantial and attractive buffers. As with all development in the UMCH focus area, it is to be high-quality in character and design with four-sided architecture. It should follow the Worthington Design Guidelines.

High Street Frontage Guidelines:

The potential redevelopment of the UMCH focus area creates a change in the consideration of setbacks along High Street in these blocks. To achieve the desired walkability, vitality, and screening of parking along Worthington's signature street, it is expected that multi-story buildings will be constructed closer to the High Street right-of-way, with parking located behind the buildings. The buildings should engage High Street with broad sidewalks, storefronts, front entries, and outdoor seating that provide an inviting strolling environment for pedestrians. The buildings constructed along High Street will set the tone and impression for the entire UMCH focus area. As such their architecture, materials, quality, interest, aesthetics, and vitality are critical. These buildings should have a predominance of brick and complement the community character. Buildings along High Street must have the majority of their building face fronting/ parallel to the street. Buildings are expected to be at least two stories in height with substantially transparent storefronts on the first floor, whether retail or office, to activate the street. Operational building entries must be provided along High Street regardless of parking orientation. Neither single-story commercial buildings nor retail buildings on out lots are part of the vision for the UMCH focus area, nor are buildings placed in the middle of parking lots.

Generally it is anticipated that buildings will be setback from the High Street curb line an appropriate distance based upon the architecture and use(s) of the buildings. The streetscape section between the building and the curb should include a sizable tree lawn or street trees in planters (ten feet +/-), at least an eight-foot wide unobstructed sidewalk, and an outdoor seating and/or landscape planting area. As the building height increases, the buildings should consider the

relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. It is expected that if fourth or fifth stories are included, a variety of techniques will be implemented to mitigate any potential "canyon" effect along High Street, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping to name a few.

While it is preferred that parking be provided to the rear of building, if parking is provided in front, it should be consistent across the frontage and be limited to either one row (single bay) of parking or on-street parking for short customer visits. Parking visible between buildings should be screened by landscape and/or masonry wall.

Development within the UMCH should be well landscaped, with particular focus on the streetscapes, building edges, buffers, and public park/community commons. Landscaping should be substantial, lush, well-planned, and commonly-maintained. Landscape should emphasize native species where possible.

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington into the newer development areas. Inclusion of sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled signage, and planting and lawn areas will help communicate a sense of a walkable pedestrian scale. Carefully designed building facades that employ traditional storefronts -- or similarly-sized windows on the first floor -- will help make new buildings more pedestrian-friendly.

Setbacks: Parking areas should be located toward the rear and not in the front setbacks if at all possible. Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a primary goal. Building up to the required setback is desirable as a means of getting pedestrians closer to the building and into the main entrance as easily as possible.

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.

Windows: On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller "storefront" units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: 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. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

Ornamentation: Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.

Color: For new brick buildings, consider letting the natural brick color be the body color, and select trim colors that are compatible with the color of the bricks. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors.

Signage: 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.

Sustainability:

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. Recommendations include: encouraging energy conservation methods; using landscape concepts to preserve energy; managing storm water run-off in an environmentally friendly way; using solar panels in locations that minimize the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties; adding bike racks; using streetscape elements that are of a human scale; making use of recycled, renewable and energy efficient materials; using natural and controlled light and natural ventilation; and minimizing light pollution.

Staff Comments:

1. Although these applications do not represent a comprehensive plan for the 41 acre site, the proposed medical office building provides a component of the plan that is desired in the community, and particularly along the High St. frontage. The development size and location would allow for other desired uses to be added in the future.

2. Parking along the High St. frontage is not desirable, but with proper screening with landscaping and masonry walls it may be acceptable. In the future, the parking could be structured and/or moved west and another building could be constructed in its place.
3. There should be pedestrian connections from the High St. sidewalk, and widening of the walkways should be considered. Bicycle parking accommodations are needed.
4. Equipment and dumpsters should be located as far from High St. as possible and well screened. Placement of the equipment on the roof behind a screen would be appropriate.
5. The guidelines call for a building entrance facing the street. Also, outdoor seating and significant planting would be appropriate in the area between the street and the building.
6. Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building.
7. Plans for landscaping (including trees to be preserved); screening; building and site lighting; storm water management; traffic; and signage are needed.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in additional speakers that arrived late to the meeting. Mr. Brown said this is the first piece of the project that would be discussed this evening and the goal was to look at the whole site holistically. This first project will help set the tone for the next development. He said the Board and staff members will be charged with how to not let this project look piece meal. The project needs to have buildings that look like they belong together. Mr. Brown continued to say they will be looking at the infrastructure to make sure that storm water will not affect neighboring buildings. He said there is still a lot to look at from utilities, lighting, storm water, traffic, etc. This first meeting was intended to get architectural comments from the Board members and input from the community.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Todd Sloan stated his address is 2469 Stone Haven Ct. S., Columbus, Ohio and he is representing the Daimler Group. Mr. Sloan said there would be two other speakers helping him and his job was to introduce people to the project. He reiterated what City staff had mentioned earlier, that they are not asking for a vote on anything this evening. The meeting is just for information purposes, and they are working towards a formal application. Mr. Sloan said they created a preliminary site plan that is just a line drawing along with preliminary sketches of what the building could look like. They are before the Board this evening to see what the important parts of the project are so they can proceed to finalize their plans. Mr. Sloan said as he looked up and down High Street there seemed to be a theme with the architecture and a lot of different ways that the buildings are placed on sites. He said they would like to hear comments about the building placement from the Board and the community. They would also like to hear about the architectural style.

Mr. Sloan introduced Dwayne Perry, a representative from Ohio Health that would explain more information about the company. Mr. Duane Perry stated his address is 4153 Reedbury Ln., Columbus, Ohio, and state he is nurse and for this project the Director of Emergency Services for Ohio Health. Mr. Perry said that most recently he was the Nursing Director for Grant Hospital's Emergency Department and three years ago he led the development of the freestanding emergency department in Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Perry said Ohio Health most recently built a similar building in Pickerington, Ohio.

Mr. Perry said this office will provide emergency services to the community, but higher level injuries will still be directed to major hospitals. He said in the past few years the emergency rooms have been getting overcrowded and causing patients to wait an excessive amount of time before being seen by a medical professional. A Board Certified Emergency physician will be on staff, and the same level of nursing care found at a major hospital would be there. There would also be scanning services. He said the Pickerington and Westerville emergency departments have minimal wait times.

Mr. Perry said they plan to put a medical office on the second floor so people will have access to primary care physicians and specialists, which he felt there is a big need for in communities. He said he does not anticipate this new office building seeing one hundred patients a day. The facility will be 8,500 square feet, have eight treatment rooms, one of which will be a triage room for sicker patients with more services. The back wall piece with a lot of glass will allow for natural light. Mr. Perry said they work closely with ambulance providers and they know what types of patients can go where.

Mr. Sloan gave an overview of the proposed building. He said the environment is less sterile looking than what you would see at a major hospital. This type of facility would normally see approximately twenty-five to thirty patients a day as opposed to several hundred per day at a major hospital. The second floor will be traditional medical office space with a combination of exam rooms, nursing offices and physician offices. There will also be a break area for staff and a waiting room for patients in the front. There will be from five to seven physicians working inside the facility.

Mr. Sloan said they were trying to be sensitive to the Comprehensive Plan guidelines which discuss putting the building up front and the parking in the rear. He said they tried to locate the building in a spot which would make the most sense next to the existing building which will remain on the site. Mr. Perry said an access point was added that will lead directly to the facility. They wanted to make sure it was easy for patients to get inside the building. Mr. Sloan said they have not done a traffic study yet, but are willing to provide one.

Mr. Sloan introduced Mr. Wes Hawkins, who is the lead architect from M + A Architects for this project. Mr. Hawkins stated his address is 6399 Youngland Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Hawkins said they have developed this proto type and have placed similar facilities in other locations. He said they would like to modify this prototype to fit into the Worthington community. Mr. Hawkins discussed some of the standards and branding elements that other facilities already have such as the brick, stone and glass materials. He also said that along with the branding people will expect a higher level of service, so they would like to keep some of the brick elements the same. Mr. Hawkins said they have created simple geometric elements and designed the windows to be large on the first floor. He said this style fits within the Comprehensive Plan and along the pedestrian walkway. Mr. Hawkins continued to say the interior style of the building is also consistent by accessing as much natural sunlight as possible and that sunlight has proven to be helpful in the natural healing process. Mr. Sloan said they are trying to keep the building green. They have not decided what the windows will exactly look like yet in regards to mullions.

Mr. Hawkins said the element in the middle of the building will likely be a screen for the mechanical equipment. He said the glass element on the building lets people know what is going on inside the building and is an easy entrance and also allows the patients in the waiting area on the second floor to be able to look outside. Mr. Hawkins said the glass is supposed to resemble the glass on a greenhouse which would have been appropriately attached to a colonial style house on a smaller scale. The entrance will have a cover where people can be dropped off and a smaller second canopy will be available for ambulance access. Mr. Brown wanted to note that this building will be about one thousand square feet larger than the new FC Bank headquarters located across the street.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to swear in a few more potential speakers. Mr. Coulter mentioned a letter was sent in by Mr. Jim Keller via e-mail and he noted the letter will be part of the record. Mr. Coulter said this project is extremely important to the City of Worthington, and this is just a preliminary meeting and nothing will be voted on this evening.

Mr. Foust said all of the comments he has received from residents in the area about the concept and use of the land have been very positive. He said this property has been under scrutiny for the last couple of years and because of that there is probably a lot more public involvement and concern about what will be developed on this site. Mr. Foust also mentioned that City Council members have also been involved and may have some comments as well. He said last summer Council President Bonnie Michael sent a letter to the developer and asked them to take a look at some of Worthington's older buildings, some of which do not exist anymore, and try to replicate the style in order to bring back the New England character of the town.

Mr. Foust said some of the developments over the past few years have involved churches and there are some lessons to be learned. The Presbyterian Church put an addition on their building several years ago, and Tom Reed was the Architect. Mr. Reed told Mr. Foust he had been to over one hundred and fifty meetings regarding the construction for the church. He said the same thing happened with the Episcopal Church which is located kitty-corner across the Village Green. When an architect came forward with a very large contemporary design to connect an 1830's church to a 1920's classroom nearby the building went through almost a year of iterations and the community chipped away at that week after week, foot by foot, piece by piece and detail by detail. Mr. Foust said it was a frustrating process. He said in contrast to those two buildings, Mr. Foust felt the Seventh Day Adventist Church approached the community to put a building on the Harding Hospital property off of East Dublin-Granville Rd. The church developer told city staff they wanted to build a New England style of church and they were going to study New England buildings. Mr. Foust said the group came back to the Board with their first set of preliminary drawings, with all of the details, and the Board members were shocked and the plans proceeded ahead with no questions or comments from the Board. Mr. Foust said he would like to see the current developer do the same thing, and cautioned them about looking at some of the more recently constructed buildings in Worthington. He explained the new Ohio Health building will be setting the tone for future buildings to be built in the area. Mr. Foust said to be careful with wording and made reference to the developer's comments about colonial elements.

Mr. Reis said he agreed with Mr. Foust's comments. He felt they were well stated well intended. Mr. Reis said he believes the developer and the Board members will take those comments to heart and the developer will come back with something that will make everyone proud.

Mrs. Holcombe said she also agreed with Mr. Foust's comments. Mr. Sauer said Mr. Foust did a very nice job. Mr. Sauer said recently there have been a couple of flat roof buildings built in the community but he was not sure that those buildings have been as successful as they had hoped. He said he was not thrilled with seeing another flat roof building. Mr. Sauer believed that style of roof is a mistake, and he is concerned about one side of the building looking different than another because a building needs to have some integrity. Mr. Sauer said he is also concerned about the placement of the building because the building is closer to High Street than other buildings. He said looking up High Street with all the trees has a certain character and he is concerned about losing that character. Mr. Sauer asked about the large Sycamore tree out front and said he would not want to see anything interfere with that tree because he believes the tree is still in good shape. Mr. Sauer was also concerned with the parking lot next to High Street. He wondered how the parking would be concealed and how the equipment would be concealed.

Mr. Coulter said one of contextual things that he wanted to talk about was sustainability and using real dimensional materials, such as full dimensional brick, not thin brick, and the use of real stone, not faux stone. He said he realizes that the proposed drawing is just a starting point but the details need to be discussed. The materials need to be as real as they can be.

Mrs. Holcombe said she agrees with the other Board members and feels they need to get away from the colonial word and focus on the New England style. She too does not want to see another flat roof building. She said really liked the glass wall so that patients could look outside.

Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed with much of what had been said already but wanted to add a little more to what had been said about sustainability. She feels this is an opportunity for leadership in the community with relation to sustainability. She said the developer made reference to the word "LEED", and natural day lighting, and she is interested in seeing what components of that the developer will bring forward through the site, storm water, and all the other details listed in the design guidelines.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak.

Ms. Suzanne Stanton stated her address is 490 Poe Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Stanton said she is not used to speaking at public meetings, but she is not new to medical development. She said freestanding emergency rooms (FSED), like what is being proposed on this site, are a very growing trend in three states, Ohio, Texas and Colorado, and not in New England. She said these types of emergency centers primarily market towards communities that have private insurance, mainly communities of affluence. Ms. Stanton said if you take a look at what has happened in Texas, and where some of the development has been, and where the patterns are going, you can look at a map of Houston and you can see twenty-eight free standing emergency room departments from one company called First Choice Adeptus Health. Ms. Stanton said Adeptus Health is now developing free standing emergency room departments in Columbus, Ohio, and they are using the Mount Carmel brand. Some of Adeptus Health's new locations can be found in the Grove City

and Lewis Center areas. Ms. Stanton continued to say that all of the citizens of the community can research what free standing emergency rooms are. She asked why they have increased sixty-one percent since 2009, and why do free standing emergency rooms only serve affluent communities. Ms. Stanton said in terms of access the people from Ohio Health say this building will not be too big, maybe treat twenty-five to thirty patients a day. She said for starters, that does not increase access for too many people. Those same twenty-five to thirty people could drive 6.1 miles to Riverside Hospital; 9.5 miles to Dublin Hospital; 8.2 miles to Westerville; 5.6 miles to St. Ann's Hospital; or 9 miles to Ohio State University Hospital.

Ms. Stanton continued to say Worthington does not have a problem with emergency services. She found a study by the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality on emergency room visits and the information was very similar to what was being mentioned this evening. Ms. Stanton said most emergency room visits are not acute trauma type of visits. The particular study from 2006 to 2011 said the number one emergency visit was due to substance abuse, and there was also a thirty-four percent increase in alcohol related problems. She said there was actually a decrease in the number of strains and sprains. Ms. Stanton said most of the really urgent medical issues will be going to bigger hospitals. The smaller issues can be handled by Urgent Care Centers. She said Mount Carmel has doubled their revenue since 2013 because of the for profit free standing emergency rooms. Ms. Stanton said that going to the emergency room for a sore throat will cost a facility fee of \$900.00 dollars. People may not realize that they will be charged a facility fee of \$900.00 for a sore throat or \$1,500.00 for a sore back. If the same condition was treated at an Urgent Care Center the bill would be about \$125.00. Mrs. Stanton recommended people think about the two elements of an emergency room that are necessary but would not have a New England look, an emergency sign and an ambulance bay. She side without those elements there is no way a consumer will know where to go. She said Ohio Health might do very well with an Urgent Care in this center, but then an ambulance bay would not be needed. Ms. Stanton said she would like to see the High Street area open and continue with the events it already has and not have the area congested with buildings. She said this emergency room will be open around the clock twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week and she urged everyone to take a look at the other freestanding emergency rooms in Texas and Colorado.

The next speaker was Mr. David Robinson, of 195 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Robinson said he did not understand how a medical building without retail will enhance the area for walkability. Mr. Robinson said he would rather walk through a wooded path.

Mr. Scott Farkas stated his address is 6025 Weatherburn Pl., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Farkas said he and his wife have lived in old Worthington for twenty-five years, and both of their children went to Worthington schools. He said he has a Master's Degree in City and Environmental Planning as well as a Law Degree, and he has worked in the planning and zoning field and has been on planning and zoning commissions in both Georgia and Virginia. Mr. Farkas said he is very familiar with comprehensive city planning, zoning and re-zoning, community development, and planning developments such as this one which proposes commercial office development and high density residential along High Street. He said Worthington's current comprehensive plan designates the Methodist's land as a Planned Unit Development and the first step on that path is the proposed medical center. Mr. Farkas said he is not surprised that the city has a preference for commercial development because of the income tax revenue that goes to the city. He said he is

not against development if done properly, but he does not believe the medical office is appropriate for this site. Mr. Farkas urged the Board members to revise the comprehensive plan and rezone the entire Methodist Children's Home property as residential. He said all comprehensive plans should reflect the goals and objectives of the community for which they are intended, and that all comprehensive plans are living, breathing documents. Mr. Farkas believed this site should not be a planned unit development. He feels the land would be better utilized as one story patio homes for empty nesters.

Mr. Brown explained the City is not going through a rezoning process for this property, and this portion of the property already has existing zoning rights in the C-2 and C-3 categories. The uses proposed this evening are permitted uses in this portion of the property. He continued to say the preference was to look at the site as a whole but the city is not rezoning the property to a Planned Unit Development.

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

Mr. Coulter explained the Municipal Planning Commission would discuss the Amendment to the Development Plan for this site. Mr. Sauer said he was concerned about the parking lot being located in the same proximity to High St. as the building. He said one day another developer may want to build a building next to the parking lot and then High Street will look like building, parking lot, building, parking lot. He does not think that pattern would be acceptable, and wondered if there could be a different plan to prevent that from happening. Mr. Brown said the next proposed development could have a building in place of the parking area. He said nothing would have to be approved if it did not meet the long term goals for the site. Mr. Sauer felt the Commission could not assume this parking would be converted to a building later. Mr. Coulter felt he could not make a determination on the issue without other details. Mr. Reis said the next tenant could request parking in the back. Mr. Reis suggested the parking lot might be okay behind the building, but Mrs. Bitar said the chapel is located behind the building and the chapel will be staying for now. Mr. Reis sympathized with Mr. Sauer's position, expressing he would not want there to be a lot of parking that close to High St. Mr. Sauer reiterated his concern about the parking being in the same line as the building, and Mrs. Holcombe agreed with his comments. Mr. Myers summarized that the applicant should explore other locations for the parking, and demonstrate this as the only location that would work for parking if that is the case. Mr. Sauer said the current parking location does not meet the vision for the site – if we do not want parking in front of buildings, why then would we want it directly next to buildings? Mr. Foust said it is just one piece of the puzzle instead of a comprehensive look at the site, so it makes it difficult to see what would happen with the rest. He asked if the developer is restricted on this piece of land, and asked if staff could look at how many of this same development would fit on the commercial part of the site. Mr. Brown said staff could look at that, and pointed out the utility easements were part of the constraint for this site.

Mr. Sloan thanked everyone for their input, and said they would come up with some options for parking. He feels they have gotten a lot of guidance tonight, and will discuss and come back changes. Mr. Foust said he strongly suggests that Mr. Sloan listen closely to what the city staff advises.

Mrs. Holcombe suggested for walkability purposes the building will need a front entrance, and Mr. Sloan said they will be unable to have a front entrance because of the use. He needs to know if that is a deal killer. She said it just needs to be address, and also feels the landscaping plan including the condition of the Sycamore tree, traffic study, and look of the emergency sign need to be addressed. Mr. Sloan said they will prepare the best application they can and are here to participate.

Mr. Coulter thanked all who spoke, and the Council members that were in attendance. He said they do not have another meeting set up yet, but notices will be set out when they are scheduled.

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

C. Other

Mr. Brown asked what members would like to attend the M.O.R.P.C. Summit on Sustainability on Friday, October 21st, 2016. Mr. Brown also said he heard the new apartments at Worthington Place are 90 percent occupied.

D. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m. and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.