



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
October 13, 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; Edwin Hofmann, Amy Lloyd and David Foust. Also present were: David Norstrom, Worthington City Council member filling in for Scott Myers, the 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 Thomas Reis was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the September 22, 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 discussed the photograph that was on display. He said the photograph was taken approximately in 1930 when the underpass was being constructed. There was a steam shovel and horse drawn cart that was being used to haul dirt and debris away from the site.

1. New

- a. Balcony Alterations – **5935 N. High St.** (Linda H. Karr/Residences of Worthington) **AR 115-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Approval was granted in 1996 for the Residences of Worthington condominiums to be built, and construction was completed in 1997. There are 54 units in the building which can be occupied by people 55 and older.

Some residents on the north and south sides of the building have had trouble with water dripping through the balconies above. This is a proposal for 10 of the balconies to address the problem.

Project Details:

1. Four of the balconies are on the north side; six are on the south side of the building.
2. The proposal involves installing ONDURA corrugated asphalt roofing sheets, which are made with a tough organic fiber core and completely infused with asphalt as the weather protection barrier, to the bottom of the balcony decks to allow water to drain to the sides.
3. A sample piece was installed under one of the balconies to make sure it was a good solution. The sample is brown, but the proposed color is white to match the sides and tops of the decks.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for use of traditional design and materials when renovating and adding onto structures in the District. 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. The proposed seems to be a practical solution that will blend in with the balconies and building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Linda Karr stated she is the representative for the Residences of Worthington. Ms. Karr said there are about ten or twelve balconies that need to be modified and they are located on the north and south sides of the building. Mr. Coulter asked if the living units on the ground level will be affected by the modification and Ms. Karr the device to be installed will prevent water from leaking through. Water will drain away from the property.

Ms. Karr's contractor, Mr. John Pershing, stated his address is 1345 Oak Hill Rd., Blacklick, Ohio. Mr. Pershing said he is a part time employee for the Residences of Worthington. He said water tends to blow in from the sides and is relatively minimal but over the years the balconies have settled and the rubber membrane causes the rain to puddle in the middle, in front of the doorway. Mr. Hofmann asked if the conditions are different with the other balconies and Mr. Pershing said only ten or twelve units are having drainage problems. Some of the units do not have balconies.

Mr. Sauer said the underside of the balconies appears to be dark and asked Mr. Pershing if he was okay with the underside being white and Mr. Pershing said yes, because white will match the rest

of the trim. 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. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LINDA H. KARR ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENCES OF WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY SOME OF THE BALCONIES AT 5935 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 115-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 115-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Roof, Soffit & Gutter Replacement - **250 E. Granville Rd.** (Richardson Exteriors/Troester)
AR 116-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house at the northeast corner of E. Granville Rd. and Pingree Dr. is a one-story house that was constructed in 1959. The house is mainly stucco, but has brick on the front elevation, and the roof has 3 tab brown shingles. This is a request to replace the roof, soffits, fascia and gutters.

Project Details:

1. Proposed for the roof are dimensional asphalt shingles that are Driftwood in color, which has shades of brown and gray.
2. The existing gutters and downspouts are proposed for replacement with new 6” aluminum gutters and 4” downspouts.
3. Existing wood fascia would be replaced with wood, and wood soffits would be replaced with vented aluminum soffits.
4. The proposed color for the fascia, soffits, gutters and downspouts would be white.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

When installing a new roof on a building that currently has asphalt shingles, avoid the uneven, “staggered-butt” design or other shingle patterns that try to create an older look; a medium gray color generally is appropriate on an older building if it originally had a slate roof. Green, red or black shingles may also be appropriate, depending on the building’s predominant colors. Avoid very light-colored shingles. When replacing gutters or downspouts, duplicate the existing as closely as possible. As with other building elements, the simplest design is usually the best.

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 proposed work is appropriate for the house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Karen Troester stated her address is 250 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Troester said she chose the color to brighten up the home. Mr. Foust asked Mrs. Troester if the house had been moved to the current location about twenty-five years ago, and Mrs. Troester said yes, but she was unaware where the house came from. 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. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RICHARDSON EXTERIORS ON BEHALF OF TIMOTHY A. TROESTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF, SOFFITS AND GUTTERS AT 250 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 116-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 116-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

c. Railings - **882 High St.** (Greg Giessler/Cam Taylor) **AR 118-16** (Amendment to AR 01-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Approval of this building was granted in 1986, and it was constructed in 1987. The existing accessible ramp was added in 1993. The property owners received approval to remove the existing ramp and steps by the front door and install a new version in January of this year. This application is a request to change the style of the railings used for the steps and ramp.

Project Details:

1. Approved originally was a wrought iron railing with top and bottom rails and no balusters. Now, a railing with vertical balusters is proposed.
2. Board of Zoning Appeals approval was granted for the railings to be located in the front setback. The existing building is about 21' from the right-of-way.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial building in Worthington.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed railing style is appropriate for this building and the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Doran stated she is the Office Manager for 882 High St. and was representing the Giessler's who were unable to attend the meeting. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. 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 GREG GIESSLER TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 01-16 BY MODIFYING THE PROPOSED RAILINGS FOR THE ENTRANCE AT 882 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 118-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 118-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 28, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

d. New Building – **780 E. Granville Rd.** (Danny Popp/Jack Maxton Chevrolet) **AR 120-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Chevrolet dealership has been in Worthington since 1926, and at this location since the 1960's. Four buildings are used by the business, including an auto maintenance building at the northwest corner of E. Granville and Huntley Roads on a parcel in the I-2 Zoning District. The existing service building was constructed in 1960 and has 2 bays and a small office.

With this application, demolition of the existing building and construction of a new auto maintenance building are proposed.

Project Details:

1. The proposed building would be located north of the existing building, and the existing

would be demolished after the new building is finished. Distances from the property line would be: 25' from the north (also owned by Maxton); 11'11" from the west (Old Huntley Rd. right-of-way); 25' from the east (New Huntley Rd. right-of-way); and 106'11" from the south (E. Granville Rd. right-of-way). Variances would be needed for location in proximity to both sides and the rear property lines.

2. The 100' wide x 43'8" deep building would house 4 service bays, a detailing bay, and an office area. The remainder of the lot, except for parts of landscaped areas along the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way, would remain paved to accommodate customer parking.
3. A flat roof is proposed for the building to match the other dealership building. Materials and colors would also match the other buildings.
4. Two foot high internally illuminated blue channel letters are proposed in the bottom half of the band at the top of the building. The main dealership building was renovated in 2012, and approved with signs that are 22" in height. Also, "JACK MAXTON" is all capitals and "Certified Service" has lower and upper case letters on the main building.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly. 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.

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.

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: Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for 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.

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.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. Although the proposed building does not meet the design guidelines in most ways, it would be complimentary to the other buildings that are part of the dealership in design and materials. The details of the sign size and lettering style should match the main building. Variances must be granted before any permits could be obtained.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Danny Popp stated he is the Architect for the Jack Maxton project and his address is 855 E. Cooke Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Popp said his client made a last minute decision and decided to emphasize the waiting area. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to go back to the photographs of the site plan and then asked her if the northwest rear corner of the property would be in line with the building that is back there and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Coulter then asked Mr. Popp if the exterior building materials will match the current dealership and Mr. Popp said yes. Mr. Coulter said he agrees with Mrs. Bitar that this project is a lot different than what they would normally expect to approve in the Architectural Review District but the materials will match the other buildings nearby. Mr. Coulter asked if there would be any landscaping maintenance and Mr. Popp said yes, they will be dressing up the area a little bit because the area is overgrown.

Mr. Foust said the photograph shows a slightly more traditional garage door with smaller panes than what has been presented. He said he was trying to remember what the windows look like on the other garage doors and Mrs. Bitar brought up a photograph of the other doors for a comparison and all have glass panels. Mr. Foust asked about the sign panels and if they would also be the same and Mr. Popp said yes. The panels will not be back lit. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Popp if his client would be okay with the same lettering height and Mr. Popp said that is why they changed their second submission so the letters would be the same height of twenty-two inches.

Mr. Coulter asked about the signage on the new building and if the sign would be illuminated at all and his client would like that if possible. Mrs. Bitar explained she understood the lettering would be the same that is currently on the dealership, internally illuminated blue.

Mrs. Bitar said the other thing that is noted is the name on the other buildings are all capital letters and the other words have lowercase letters also. Mr. Popp said would not be a problem if the Board prefers that.

Mr. Sauer said the panels around the other buildings go around the top and on the other side and the drawings suggest the panels do not go all the way back and that was due to budgetary reasons. Mr. Sauer asked if the panels could be more consistent with the other buildings and Mr. Popp said they could probably do that. Mr. Coulter asked if there would be mechanical equipment located on the roof and Mr. Popp said there will be a condensing unit on the top but will be screened by a parapet wall.

Mr. Foust said he wanted to point out that this area is separated by the railroad track from the rest of the Architectural Review District and feels the design is appropriate for the area. He asked Mr. Popp if the freestanding sign out front will be replaced and Mrs. Bitar said that was taken care of at the last approval. Mr. Popp said that there are no plans to do anything with the sign. 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. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DANNY POPP ON BEHALF OF CAR JMC LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH THE EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCT A NEW BUILDING AT 780 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 120-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 120-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 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 new signage illumination will match the existing character of illumination;
- That the fascia panels on the front façade will return the full width on both side elevations;
- All capital letters are acceptable for the Jack Maxton sign as long as the height of the letters do not extend over twenty-two inches;
- Based on the elevations that were received with today's date.

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

- e. Changes to Detached Condominium Plans – **41 E. New England Ave.** (Robert & Theresa Capace /Worthington Lodge LLC) **AR 117-16** (Amendment to AR 50-14)

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Planned Unit Development Modification

- a. Changes to Detached Condominium Plans – **41 E. New England Ave.** (Robert & Theresa Capace/Worthington Lodge LLC) **PUDM 02-16** (Modification to PUD 03-14)

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This parcel, which includes the former lodge and the area west of the access drive to the Worthington United Methodist Church (WUMC) parking lot, was rezoned as a PUD in 2015. The

portion of the property at 41 E. New England Ave. was approved as a single family structure. Although the parcel is not proposed to be split, the applicants plan to build the structure and own it as a condominium. These applications are a request for approval of modifications to the previously approved plans for the house.

Project Details:

1. The house is proposed in the same location as was previously approved, which is 19.1' from the east side of the access drive to the WUMC parking lot; 6.7' from the east property line; about 41' from the south property line, with the drive being 14.3' from the south property line; and 30.5' from the north property line.
2. The original approval showed the house being constructed at grade, but the new owners would like to construct a basement foundation for the house. Visually, 2.5' of the foundation would be exposed under the house, and is proposed to be faced with Dutch Quality Stone (Ohio White View Limestone – color). Because the front porch would also be raised, steps with rails would be needed, therefore requiring MPC approval for proximity to the front property line. The porch foundation would also be faced with the stone, and the deck and railings would be Trex material, which is a composite that includes recycled material. White railings and natural wood colored decking are proposed. Steps with railings are also proposed for the side entrance from the house to the patio.
3. Building height is also proposed to increase so the first floor ceiling can be 10' instead of 9' high.
4. Proposed materials are mainly the same as were approved previously, although minor changes and additional specifications have been submitted:
 - 6" lap LP Smart Siding is proposed to be painted "Charcoal Cashmere" (gray), and "Falling Snow" (white) would be used for the trim.
 - The asphalt shingles for the roof would be "Driftwood".
 - Standing seam metal proposed for the front porch and garage roofs, and as a trim element in the gables, is proposed to be "Charcoal Gray".
 - Windows are proposed to be double-hung 6 over 6 Andersen vinyl clad windows, and the window trim would also be from Andersen. The windows are proposed as simulated divided light with muntins on the outside, and removable muntins on the inside.
 - The doors would be Andersen fiberglass with simulated wood for staining. The front door would be 6 panels, with the top 2 being windows, painted "Arroyo Red", and include sidelights and a transom above. On the side would be double doors with simulated divided light muntins. The lights in and around the doors would match the proportions of the lights in the windows as closely as possible.
 - The rear attached garage is proposed with a white, double, raised panel, steel door with windows at the top. Two different styles for the panels are included in the packet, but both have windows at the top.
 - Two carriage lights are proposed for each of the three doors. A catalogue cut is in the packet.

- Aluminum gutters and vinyl soffits are proposed and would match the trim color.
 - Fiberglass columns are proposed for the front porch.
5. The landscaping plan approved before would not change. Included were: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; a patio on the west side; a concrete drive to the south; and screening for the condensing unit.
 6. The expected completion of this structure would be about 12 months after approval.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;

9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

Final Plan Modifications from Code:

City Staff - The City staff may authorize minor design modifications that are required to correct any undetected errors or that are consistent with the purpose of the approved Final Plan. Such modifications shall be limited to:

1. Minor adjustments in lot lines provided no additional lots are created;
2. Minor adjustments in location of Building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required Yards remain in compliance;
3. Minor adjustments in Building height;
4. Minor modifications in Structure design and materials, and lighting provided there is the same general appearance; and
5. Minor modifications of landscaping, including substitution of materials.

Municipal Planning Commission - The Municipal Planning Commission shall review modifications other than those listed in the above section, and any of the above modifications as recommended by City staff.

1. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification keeps the essential character of the approved PUD, and does not require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall approve such modification.
2. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification requires an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for such amendment.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending ARB & MPC approval of the applications, as the modifications keep the essential character of the approved PUD, and are appropriate based on the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bob Capace stated that his address is 3953 Kul Circle South, Hilliard, Ohio. Mr. Capace brought samples to present to the Board. Mr. Coulter

asked Mr. Capace if there would be windows in the basement and Mr. Capace said yes. Mr. Capace said he also wanted to note the porch will be constructed on concrete instead of Trex material. Mrs. Holcombe said she felt the concrete would be more appropriate and was a wise choice of Mr. Capace to add a basement to the house.

Mr. Sauer noticed the stone base around the front porch and asked if Mr. Capace would consider using stone around the entire foundation and Mr. Capace said that is what they have already planned. Mrs. Lloyd said she wanted to go back to the question about basement windows and asked Mr. Capace what type of windows will be used and where the windows will be located. Mr. Capace said there will be two windows on the east side of the house and he will be using traditional glass windows, not glass block.

Mr. Sauer said he noticed soft vinyl plastic material will be used for the soffit and wanted to know if the vents will be all around the house. Mr. Sauer was concerned with the vented soffit because he did not feel that was appropriate for this style of home, and asked if individual vents could be used and Mr. Capace said yes. Mrs. Bitar said wood or LP material would be appropriate. Mr. Norstrom asked if the basement windows would be above ground or below ground. Mr. Capace said probably one window above grade and one window below grade for egress. Mr. Coulter said he would like to see what the escape well will look like, because the well is required per the building code. Mr. Capace said the well will not be visible, except from the south east corner of the house. Mrs. Bitar explained that will need to be part of the PUD application because of the proximity to the neighboring property, but if the Board agrees that can be on the site plan in the form of an amendment. Mr. Coulter explained that staff can approve the well.

Mr. Foust noted the standing seam roof had two labels, the main roof had SS1 and the standing seam above the garage is labeled SS2 and wanted to know if the color would all be the same. Mrs. Bitar said the roof will be all the same charcoal gray color according to the architect. Mrs. Bitar explained the style of the garage door needed to be discussed and Mr. Capace said his wife liked garage door style number two and Mrs. Holcombe agreed.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT AND THERESA CAPACE TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 50-14 TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE AT 41 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 117-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 117-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 27, 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 front porch will be made of concrete instead of Trex material;
- That there will be basement windows on the east side of the home, one of which will be standard sized above ground and the other will be an emergency escape window;
- That the stone veneer will continue around the full perimeter of the foundation wall;
- That the soffit material will be of a solid appearance with individual vents rather than a slotted or perforated soffit;
- That all standing seam roofing will be of the same color;

- That the garage door will be design number two as presented at the meeting.

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

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

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT AND THERESA CAPACE TO MODIFY PUD 03-14 WITH MINOR DESIGN CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE AT 41 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. PUDM 02-16, DRAWINGS NO. PUDM 02-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 27, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THERE WILL BE AN EMERGENCY ESCAPE BASEMENT WINDOW ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE HOME AND ONE NORMAL SIZED BASEMENT WINDOW.

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

2. Conditional Use

- a. Office in the C-5 Zoning District – **752 High St.** (COHatch Worthington LLC) **CU 16-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building was built in 1927, with additions constructed in 1932 and 1956. The building was originally the library, and was more recently used as the Worthington Schools administrative offices. The City of Worthington took possession of the building in 2006. In an ongoing effort to preserve the building, and provide leasable space to prospective commercial tenants, various alterations were approved and have been constructed. In 2009, the City Council rezoned the property to the C-5 Zoning District to allow leasing of the space to a variety of users. The Municipal Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for a restaurant last year that did not move forward. The only tenant in the building at this time is Sew to Speak, which is an arts and crafts business and therefore allowed in the building without special approval. Sew to Speak is located in the northern part of the building on the first floor.

This application is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an office use in most of the

remainder of the building, and potentially outdoor space.

Project Details:

1. COHatch is the proposed tenant for this space. COHatch offers office rentals and meeting spaces that are available by the hour, day, or month. This office space would be in addition to its recently opened space at 659 High St.
2. The proposed use would occupy about 2422 sf on the first floor and include roughly 5-15 offices, 2-4 meeting rooms and an event space. A makerspace is proposed for the basement that would include things like a 3D printer, sound studio, art studio, photo studio and other equipment. That area would be about 2042 sf and be in the northern part of the building. The southern part of the basement would likely be used for storage. COHatch has also expressed an interest in construction of patio space, which would come to the ARB for approval.
3. COHatch anticipates 50-100 members using the space at different times. There are 22 parking spaces north of the building and along the Village Green Dr. that can be used by the building tenants. In addition, there is public parking available west of High St. near the Griswold Center and south of SR 161. Bike racks are in place near the north end of the building and there is easy pedestrian access to the site.
4. The offices would be open for member use at all times.

Conditional Use Permit Basic Standards and Review Elements:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – With parking available at the north end of the property, along the Village Green Dr., and in the public parking lots in Old Worthington, it should be sufficient to handle the demand. Additional traffic to this quadrant of the Village Green would add to the vibrancy of the downtown.
2. Effect on public facilities – The effect should be minimal.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities - The effect should be minimal.
4. Utilities required - The increase should be minimal.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – The hours would be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No changes are proposed at this time, but could be addressed by the Architectural Review Board when proposed.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No changes are proposed at this time, but could be addressed by the Architectural Review Board when proposed. This building was used as an office for many years.

Land Use Plans:

Comprehensive Plan

Focus retail and office uses in the High Street corridor with particular attention on retail for first floors in Old Worthington. Continue to reinforce the contributing uses and community orientation of the Village Green.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although office uses are not typically desired

on the first floor, the nature of this business is such that it should contribute to the vibrancy of the location. Patio space could also be beneficial.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present and Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Matt Davis of 4620 Hickory Rock Dr., Powell, Ohio. Mr. Davis said COHatch opened on October 4th, 2016, and already has thirty-seven members in the first couple of weeks, all of the private offices have been sold out, and they have already had three private events, two of which were for charities. Mr. Davis said in addition to renting private offices, they also have co-working memberships available where people can work part-time or fulltime in meeting rooms that can be rented. He said there are businesses that are coming to Worthington just to use the meeting space.

Mr. Davis said they have something he is very proud of which is a Community Membership which is fifty dollars per month. He said COHatch's mantra is "Love where you work and who you work with, work in a town you want to be in, live in the city you want to work with, take care of your health". Everybody gets a free membership to the Snap Fitness health facility and wellness program that is built in, and you also take care of the community through philanthropy. Any of the members can use their space on nights and weekends for free as long as they donate to the kiosk for one of their partners which is the Worthington Food Pantry. Mr. Davis said he is working with Jennifer Fralick who works for the pantry. He said they are working together to set up drop-off locations, including their warehouse in the back. Mr. Davis said they will be packing groceries for families in their space on Saturdays. He said he spent a lot of time and money on the Worthington Hardware space, and feels it turned out phenomenally.

Mr. Davis said the City approached him to see if he was interested in the James Kilbourne Memorial Library space. Mr. Davis said this space is unique because there is a park, so they are considering building an outdoor patio made of blue stone, which would be half public and half private. He said the top floor would be used for private one and two person offices and he already has a wait list of six people for this building. They will also have something called Launchpad where a person can take their team offsite and have creative sessions like a similar space in downtown Columbus called Sparkspace. Mr. Davis said he was contacted a few days ago because the downtown business is out of space. He said he is most excited about the basement. The name will be COHatch Creative, and the whole point will be to allow co-working of different artists, whether painters, clay work, photography, digital arts and 3-D printing and an engineering technology center. Eventually products will be sold. The members can use the private offices upstairs for free and have galleries on Village Green, etc. Mr. Davis said he is an innovative guy and happy to do something that is cool. He said he has met with officials from the library that would like to help create programs for children and other people, and teachers. He said he respects the architecture of the building and will make sure to protect the character while restoring the building.

Mr. Coulter said he was happy to hear that the use of the building will bring in people to Worthington that otherwise would not come here because that type of space is not available today. He is glad to see this proposal come forward. Mr. Coulter said he is anxious to see what could happen with the patio however that develops.

Mr. Foust said if you have not seen the space above the hardware store you should go take a look. He said the space was really well done. Mr. Foust asked if the basement was going to be remodeled too and Mr. Davis said yes. He asked Mr. Davis if the metal kitchen set would stay and Mr. Davis said he would do everything in his power to make sure the kitchen set stays. He said he plans to turn the area into a café, but he needs to make the area work again. There will not be storage in the basement, the basement will be a cool hang out sort of like a lounge with a pinball machine with maybe a keg of beer. The space will be meant for meetings in a cool environment that is totally different. Mr. Sauer asked if there have been any provisions made to have a dumpster on the site and Mr. Brown said staff is working with both tenants regarding trash removal. Mr. Davis said his business has a very minimal amount of trash. He said the most trash might come from luncheons. Mr. Davis said he has partnered with the Worthington Inn and The Whitney House to provide catering when needed. He said since the restaurants are so close they just take the trash off site. 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. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY COHATCH FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AN OFFICE IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 752 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. CU 16-16, DRAWINGS NO. CU 16-16, DATED SEPTEMBER 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; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)

3. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. New Buildings – **890 & 910 High St.**; Demolition - **33 E. North St.** (Plank Law Firm, LPA)
ADP 07-16

&

B. Architectural Review Board (continued)

1. New (continued)

- f. New Buildings – **890 & 910 High St.**; Demolition - **33 E. North St.** (Plank Law Firm, LPA)
AR 119-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Two buildings were approved at this location south of the CVS building in 2007 when CVS was approved. The buildings were planned with second floors in the front portion of building to accommodate 4 residential units for a total of 4960 sf of upstairs building area. In the larger building to the south ("B"), the units would have been 1417 sf each; in the smaller building to the north ("A"), the units would have been 1063 sf each. At the July 2012 meeting, the Board and Commission approved a modified version of the two buildings, which were proposed without usable second floors. The City Council denied the Amendment to Development plan application because it did not include usable second floors.

With the new applications, the property owner is requesting approval of 2 buildings that are similar in footprint and design to the previously approved, but now 6402 sf of office space is proposed above Building "B" to the south. Building "A" would not have a usable second floor. Also, demolition of the office building at 33 E. North St. and construction of additional parking is proposed.

Project Details:

1. Site: The buildings are proposed further from High St. than was originally approved, with Building "A" shown 18' 1/2" from the property line (~42' from the roadway), and Building "B" shown 19' 5/8" from the property line (~43' from the roadway). Previously, the buildings were at 11' and 16.3' from the property line. Brick paver patios are proposed in front of each building, as are curbed planter beds, benches, waste receptacles and bike racks. These items would match those previously approved for the site, except the owner is willing to modify the color from the existing green to black. The existing sidewalk and tree lawn would stay.

Early this year the City Council approved the division of the CVS property from the rest of the parcel, with the lot line being along the south end of the CVS building. A variance would be needed to construct Building "A" in the proposed location, which is 8' from the newly created property line. Building "A" was 8' from the CVS building in the previously approved plans, so the only change is due to the lot split.

The access drive located between the buildings sites would remain, as would the existing parking behind CVS and Building "A". The asphalt parking lot would be extended into the area behind Building "B" as was previously approved, and 13 spaces and a drive aisle are proposed in place of the building at 33 E. North St.

The three dumpsters with enclosures near the back of the site would remain.

Lighting for the site would include the addition of three poles to match the existing, with the fixtures at 14', the pole top at 16'6", and the pole base at grade so the concrete foundation is not exposed. The poles and fixtures would be black, with the lamps being 250 watt metal halide. The fixtures at the east corners of the rear parking would have shields on the rear so light would not spill onto the adjacent residential properties and the light source would not be seen. The photometrics show 0 footcandles at the property lines.

2. Buildings:

Building “A” is proposed as 4272 sf in area, with a gabled asphalt roof and dormers over the front part of the building. The rear part of the building would have a flat roof with a solid rail around the edge to screen equipment. A brick veneer finish is proposed for the building with a combination of wood and metal trim in off-white. Although proposed to be occupied by a single retail tenant, PetPeople, the building façade would have the look of three storefronts, and could be divided if necessary in the future. Columns would be placed between the storefronts, and would support a narrow roof structure. The window systems are proposed with clad casement windows with integral muntins and wood trim. The three dormers would be centered on the storefronts below, and finished with Hardi lap siding, wood trim, standing seam metal roofing, and 6 over 6 windows. On the south side, there would be 4 double-hung windows with transoms, brick soldier courses, awnings and lights above. At the rear of the south side and at the rear of the building, herringbone patterned brick accent panels with a soldier course above are proposed instead of windows. The north side would have brick panels instead of windows.

Building “B” is proposed to be a full two story brick building with 6402 sf of area per floor. The first floor would likely be retail or restaurant, with the second floor being office space. Like “A”, “B” would have a gable across the front part of the building, but would then have a hipped roof extending to the rear. Two chimneys are proposed at the ends of the front gable. The first floor could accommodate 1-3 tenants, and would have 3 storefront elements across the front. The center element is proposed with a gable above and extends out further than the sides. The side elevations show columns framing the center, but the front elevation and renderings do not. Clarification is needed.

The storefront windows would have wood trim with sign bands above. Three double-hung windows are proposed for the second floor centered on each of the storefronts. The sides would have 9 over 6 double hung windows with transoms, brick soldier courses, awnings and lights above at the front, and herringbone patterned brick accent panels with a soldier course above to the rear. On the south elevation a double door is proposed that would provide access to the front stairs. The second floors would have nine 6 over 6 double hung windows lined up with the windows or brick panels below. At the rear, three doors would be accessed from a raised walkway with steps at one end and a ramp at the other end. The wall of the walk would be faced with brick to match the building. A small canopy with a standing seam metal roof is proposed above each entrance. The building is proposed with interior stairwells in the northeast and southwest corners of the building, and would have an elevator at the northeast corner.

Materials for the buildings are as follows:

- Dimensional Asphalt Shingles – Owens Corning - Estate Gray
- Fabric Awnings – Sunbrella – Toast for “A”; Navy for “B”
- Brick – Glen-Gery – Rustic Burgundy; Mortar – Cemex 40A
- Windows & Doors – Pella Architect Series Double Hung and Casement Windows – Putty (integral muntins – on inside and outside of glass)
- Metal Fascia, Downspouts & Gutters – Sandstone for “A”; Classic Bronze for “B” (prefinished color)

- Paint – Benjamin Moore
 - Monterey White - Railing/fence on back of “A”
 - Lenox Tan - Fascia, rake, frieze and trim boards
 - Hodley Red – Window and door head, sill & surrounds for “A” first floor
 - Old Navy – Window and door head, sill & surrounds for “B”
- 6” Hardieplank Lap Siding – “A” dormers
- Vinyl, PVC or Clear Cedar - Fascia, rake, frieze and trim boards; window and door head, sill & surrounds; pilasters; roof canopies

Lighting for the buildings would consist of small gooseneck lamps above the sign bands and awnings, and wall packs along the sides and rear of the buildings. All fixtures would be black, and made by LSI Industries.

33 E. North St. from the applicant: “...was constructed in 1965 and purchased by M.K. & K. Realty, Inc. in 1986. The building is a two story building with the first floor being more of a basement due the majority of it being subsurface. The building was poorly designed in a long and narrow configuration that results in inefficient tenant space layouts. The second floor and basement each consist of approximately 3,750 s.f. The basement is not desirable tenant space and is further made worse by the structural block walls throughout the floor limiting the useable space and possibilities for tenants. The first floor of the building has also been historically difficult to lease due to the long and narrow construction of the building and only containing 3,750 s.f. Demolishing this old office building will allow for additional parking and construction of the two story building depicted on the site plan as Building “B” with 6,402 s.f. of new, better useable, second floor office space fronting N. High St.” The building at 33 E. North St. is not a contributing structure in the Worthington Historic District.

3. Landscaping/Screening: The street trees across the High St. frontage are well established and will remain. Also, existing vegetation along the south property line would be preserved. Shrubs and trees are proposed along the south property line to fill in gaps toward the rear, and shrubs would continue around the corner to the north. Also, shrubs are proposed for the northeast corner of the rear parking lot. A wood shadowbox fence is in place along the property line that borders residential to the rear, but needs to be repaired and/or replaced in some areas.

New trees, perennials and shrubs are proposed in front of each building, and on the south and east sides of Building “B”.

A planting area consisting of Spartan Junipers, Winter Gem Boxwoods, Shenandoah Switchgrass, Little Spire Russian Sage, Gracillimus Maiden Grass and Dense Yews is proposed to screen the new parking area from North St.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: New construction should take special care to employ scale, form, and massing that are similar to and compatible with existing building designs.

Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington. 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.

Materials: New buildings should employ only traditional wood and brick. Contemporary materials that simulate wood can be acceptable if done well, and brick veneer construction over a wood frame also is acceptable. 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: 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. 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.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Buildings at North St. and High St. should frame the pedestrian space and street, invite browsing, create second story-office or residential opportunities, and locate and screen the parking in the rear of the site

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The site and building design are in character with the Design Guidelines and the previous Development Plan for this property. Demolition of an obsolete office building and the addition of new office space in Old Worthington is desirable.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank stated he is an attorney and representing his client who is the applicant and owner of the property. Mr. Plank said his client was aware that Worthington City Council wanted second floor residential space, but his client feels this area would not be good for residential space. They are willing, however, to take the risk in having office space. He said in order to get an additional 6400 s.f. of office space they needed to offer more parking, which is why they are asking for the E. North St. building to come down. Mr. Plank said it is not a nice building, the building is very difficult to rent, and when he had discussions with CVS they asked if the building could come down. Mr. Plank said he would like to turn the discussion over to the architect, and he would also like to have comments on record about the neighboring property owners.

Mr. Rob McGinnis stated he works for Ford & Associates Architects. Mr. McGinnis said they brought sample materials, the same of which were approved in 2007 and 2012. They have the same brick, shingles, roofline, and same awning and paint colors.

Mr. Sauer wondered if more windows could be added to the lower level to make the area look more friendly and inviting. Mr. McGinnis explained they put as many windows as they possibly could on the second floor. He said they are not sure who the second tenant will be. The other tenant could possibly be a restaurant, and they do not want to use fake windows. They are trying to plan where the utilities might go. Mr. McGinnis felt there would be additional room on the south side of the building facing the drive but not towards the CVS building. He said the back of the building will be mainly for employees. Mr. Coulter agreed with Mr. Sauer and if possible to

make the transition easy for the punched in window areas to be converted into actual window later on.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if on Building A's north elevation windows could not be located there because that is where the firewall will be and Mr. Sauer said that is correct, that will not happen. Mrs. Lloyd said looking at the west building elevation she was having trouble with the massing of the building on the second floor. She said she could see where they were trying to borrow from some of the elements that are on the CVS building but thought there were some things that did not proportionally work for this building, but did work for the other building. She felt this was another window issue. Mr. Hofmann said that is his commentary as well. He said he appreciated the general massing of both buildings but some of the details need to be considered and agreed that the upper dormers on the west elevation of Building A are under-scaled. Mr. Hofmann said he understood the architects are trying match the CVS building. Mr. Hofmann then asked Mrs. Bitar to refer to the photographs for the elevations of Building B. He said he felt the pediment is under-scaled and that maybe the trim and profiles need to be as robust as the north and south elevations.

Mr. Coulter said he did like the chimneys but felt that they were too narrow from the front and rear. He also said he did like the proportions on the north and south elevations. Mr. McGinnis said if you take a look at the top elevations those proportions were taken from the CVS building and if you look at the chimneys there the profile is the same. The building is smaller so proportionally the building is thinner. Mr. Coulter said the Board members appreciate the work that has been done and he feels the plans just need tweaked a little bit.

Mr. Sauer asked if the storefronts will be constructed of wood or metal, and Mr. McGinnis stated the storefronts will have a wood finish, but the framing is to be determined, so the framing could be metal. He said what the Board members were looking at was a smooth cedar panel or could be PVC material, something that was more durable. Mr. McGinnis said those project out maybe eight inches or a foot to give depth. He said another project they are working on is framed with metal studs and has a smooth finish over that. A photo was shown.

Mr. Coulter said one of the concerns that he would like to put on the table tonight because of the issues with CVS, is that the elevations shown need to be the elevations that are built, and he said he was referring to the ground elevations. Mr. McGinnis said he is aware of the situation because the topic was brought up at his firm because they were responsible for the presentation to the Board, but they were not the ones that were responsible for producing the construction documents and unfortunately some of the details were not followed through. Mr. McGinnis said he knows from his time at Ford & Associates, that Mr. Ford is very committed to the detailing.

Mr. Foust said he remembers the controversy from the last project and he was not sure who to address the question to but the concerns that City Council had at the time concerning the second floor, if this design proposal addresses those concerns. Mr. Norstrom said City Council's concern was the need for second floor residential use of the building and this does not address that concern because this use will be for commercial office space. Mr. Plank said CVS originally represented that the second floor was supposed to be residential. He said he is not sure that the issue was residential per say, but really the use of the second floor. If CVS had presented office space that may have passed as well. Mr. Norstrom the first time around City Council wanted the second floor

space to be residential but he is not sure about the second time around because he was not a member of City Council at that time. Mrs. Bitar reiterated that when this came back in 2012 City Council was concerned there was no useable space on the second floor because the application had been approved as having residential space on the second floor. She also said she did not believe that City Council had ever considered the space being anything other than residential space on the second floor. She is not sure if this will meet City Council's desires but the issue was the lack of useable space on the second floor. Mr. Foust said he has heard comments from City staff members over the years that there needs to be more office use in the community and the only reason he raised the question is because if there is going to be an issue the issue should be addressed up front instead getting to far down the road. Mr. Foust said he has no problem with a business office use in this space.

Mr. Coulter said at the time if someone was presenting the opportunity to have residential space on the second floor the Board encouraged that. Mr. Coulter said he also agreed with Mr. Foust about office and hopes this will be a fully occupied building. Mr. Plank said he does also and wanted to point out the square footage for the second building exceeds the total square footage that would have been for residential on both of the others. He also said CVS's proposal was a little selfish because residential requires less parking and that meant there would be less parking to compete with CVS. Mr. Plank said the problem will be solved by tearing down the building behind CVS. Mr. Norstrom said that if he remembers correctly, he believed that Representative Mike Duffey pushed for residential on the second floor because at the time, City Council wanted more density with retail on the first floor. Mr. Norstrom said this is a different time now, but feels the discussion of residential versus retail needs to happen. He also said some City Council members are different than when the issue first took place.

Mr. Sauer said he likes the amount of space on the second floor and he feels the use proposed is fine. He said he was curious as to how tenants will access that space and feels the area might be more inviting if the entrance to that space was more substantial instead of just a small door. Mr. Coulter said that is a really good idea because people may get confused as to where the back entrance is. He also felt the area needs more architectural detail to be more inviting.

Mr. Sauer said wondered if the paved surface taking the place of the North St. building will run all the way to the property line which abuts the dental office next door, and if there should be a buffer between the properties. Mr. Foust wondered if parking lights might bother the nearby properties and thought maybe a fence or landscaping would be a good buffer between the properties. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Plank if there was any thought to adding a three or four foot buffer space and add some trees. Mr. Plank said he has been meeting with the property owner to the east to determine how to treat that situation. He said for the first time the dental office will be visible, and there will be a six inch curb. Mr. Plank said there is a six foot fence around the rear parking lot that will be replaced. He said the Code does not require screening because commercial property is sitting next to commercial property. A board on board fence would not work because people might back into it. Mr. Plank said no matter what happens today and before this goes to City Council he will continue meeting with the neighbors, and said there has been some discussion of them moving into the new second story office space because they can offer them something much nicer than where they are located today. Mr. Plank said he does not want to slow down discussions but at the same

time if they want the visibility the space is available. Mr. Foust asked if the Urgent Care was moving and Mr. Plank said yes, but he does not know where they are moving to.

Mr. Brown said he would like to circle back to Mr. Norstrom's question about the use. He said that ultimately this matter will go on to City Council for their decision but he felt that they brought up some good points about having the discussion although some of the Board members feel this is not a huge issue about going from four residential units to 6,400 s.f. of full second story space instead, but to flush out some of the issues before this gets to City Council and goes through the public process as per the Code.

Mr. Coulter said he does like the idea of having a full second story for a lot of reasons, one of which is hopefully a business can move in that space and can pay payroll tax which is an advantage for the City, he feels this is a good use for this space, sustainable, and he liked the architecture because of the similarity of what the Board has seen before. Mr. Coulter reiterated he likes Mr. Sauer's comments about dressing up the back side entrance so the area can be more inviting and interesting.

Mr. Sauer wondered if the Building B entrance could be at the southeast rather than northeast end of the building. Mr. McGinnis said the original intent of laying out the stairs was to be as flexible as possible for the second floor. They were spaced in the manner they are and located at the northeast portion of the plan to be accessible to the rest of the site and the parking area. Mr. McGinnis said he would be more concerned if the main entry is on the southeast corner if they flipped the plan because it might get lost in the far corner of the site and the stairs is a means of egress and not the main entrance. He said they studied that in the beginning and can certainly look at the idea again but where things are located now will function in the best way.

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

Mr. Bryan Greer said he is an officer with the North Street Dental practice next door and while speaking with Mr. Kessler and Mr. Plank he said they have no objection to tearing the building down because this will benefit the practice as well. Mr. Greer said they would not want a wall or a fence separating the area. He felt headlights would not be a concern for the retirement home because there is a line of large trees that separate their property on the east side from the retirement home. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Greer if he was happy with the direction that things are going and Mr. Greer said yes. Mrs. Holcomb said she was happy to hear that Mr. Greer did not want a fence because she would rather see softer landscaping for the area. She also said she did not want to see a fake second story and happy there will be office space upstairs. Mr. Greer said that since the west side of their business will be exposed they would do something to add detail so that there is not just an exposed stucco wall. Mr. Sauer said what Dr. Conroy has done with her building is very nice and neat.

Dr. Sara Conroy stated she is the Dentist that occupies the space next door and they are thrilled with the new project. She said she grew up in Worthington and is happy to see things moving in a positive direction. There were no other speakers.

Mr. Sauer asked since there were a number of details that were discussed this evening if the

application should be tabled. Mr. Coulter said he was comfortable moving forward with the Amendment to the Development Plan, and if necessary the motion could be adjusted. The applicant will need to come back to discuss some of the architectural issues. Mrs. Bitar explained the application includes all of the same drawings as seen by the Architectural Review Board, so staff would like to see both of the applications stay together as a package. Mr. Brown explained when this is ready to go before City Council, Council would like to see a clean package.

Mr. McGinnis asked for clarification as to what needs to be focused on and Mr. Coulter said the rear entrance for the office portion. Mr. Hofmann stated determining where real windows can be added, or prepped for use as real windows in the future; improving the scale of the dormer windows on Building A; adding more appropriate details or elements, proportionate pediment profiles to be increased in scale on Building B; the chimneys widened on Building B on the west and east elevation; and to make the office tenant entry more proud with additional architectural details. Mr. Plank requested the applications be tabled.

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

Mr. Hofmann moved to table the MPC application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye" and the application was tabled.

2. Unfinished

- a. Site Redevelopment - Hotels and Restaurants – **7007 N. High St.** (Alliance Hospitality, Inc./Holiday Inn) **AR 32-16**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant requested this next item be tabled.

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

C. Other

Mr. Brown said he did not have any updates yet for the Ohio Health project yet, nor the Holiday Inn. He also reminded the Board members to keep checking their city email addresses for information, and reminded Mr. Coulter and Mr. Norstrom they were signed up for the Summit on Sustainability with the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC).

D. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m. and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.