



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
October 12, 2017

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: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; James Sauer; Edwin Hofmann; 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.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the September 14, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board – Unfinished

1. Holiday Inn Site Redevelopment – **7007 N. High St.** (Alliance Hospitality, Inc.) **AR 32-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This roughly 7.5 acre parcel, zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services, has been home to a hotel since 1975. The original approval was for a Hilton Inn. The brand has changed several times over the years with the most recent being the conversion to a Holiday Inn in 2007, which included many upgrades to the building and site.

The owner is proposing demolition of the existing hotel, and redevelopment of the site with a mix of uses. Concepts for the site were discussed at the March 10, June 23, November 10 and

December 8, 2016 ARB meetings, at which the applicant received feedback from the Board and the public.

With this submittal, the proposed development has changed significantly with a reduction in hotel and other commercial space on the site. Also, architectural drawings are not included.

Project Details:

1. Uses:

- One hotel, with 111 guest rooms is proposed. The existing Holiday Inn has 232 guest rooms.
- Other potential uses on the site are described as restaurants and professional services.
- In the C-4 Zoning District, personal and business services and hotels are Permitted Uses. Restaurants and offices (professional services) are Conditional Uses needing approval from the MPC.

2. Site Plan and Landscaping:

- The proposed plan shows an entrance to the site from W. Wilson Bridge Rd. at the west end of the site that is now proposed to line up with the mall entrance at that location. Also, an entrance is proposed on Caren Ave. just west of the existing entrance. Elimination of entrances toward the east end of the site on W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and on N. High St. are proposed.
- One four story hotel is proposed ~77' from the south property line and ~226' from the west property line. The main entrance would be on the north side of the building.
- Four restaurant and professional services buildings would be along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and one is proposed at N. High St. All five buildings would be one story in height.
- W. Wilson Bridge Rd. – The four buildings are proposed along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. about 20' from the existing right-of-way line. The City has requested an additional 15' of right-of-way be dedicated, so the buildings would be about 5' from the new line. Sidewalk would be provided along the buildings, and a 10' multi-use path would be closer to the street. Pedestrian access and patios would be between the buildings which would allow for restaurant seating areas.
- N. High St. – The building proposed along the N. High St. frontage would be about 25.5' from the existing right-of-way. Right-of-way dedication of 15' is shown on the plan.
- Sidewalks are shown throughout the site, with access to the public sidewalk at multiple locations.
- The applicant calculates 415 parking spaces would be required on the site based on the proposed uses, and 344 spaces are being provided.
- Parking lot and street trees are shown on the plan, but a full landscape plan would be needed.
- A storm water plan will be required.
- Updated traffic information is needed for review.

3. Architecture, lighting and signage plans would be needed.

4. Variances:

- Application to the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required to approve any variances requested for the site.
 - The applicant is applying as part of the C-4 Zoning District, but is also trying to meet the requirements for the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Variances would likely be needed for setback, building height and parking not meeting the C-4 regulations.
5. Conditional Use Permits:
- Needed for offices (Professional Services)

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.

8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **Sustainability:** 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. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Landscape concepts often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Utilize indigenous plant materials, trees, and landscape features, especially those which perform passive solar energy functions such as sun shading and wind breaks. Preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practicable. Manage storm water run-off through the use of rain gardens, permeable forms of pavement, rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended. Minimize light pollution.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

Site Layout:

Setbacks: Buildings and parking should be set back to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and building, with some variations in the Building Setback Line encouraged throughout the WBC.

- Buildings 50,000 square feet in area or less shall be located between 5’ and 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way Lines. Buildings greater than 50,000 square feet in area shall be located at least 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way lines.
- Buildings on properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 50’ to the property line. Parking facilities and access drives on properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 25’ to the property line.
- Setback areas in front of retail uses shall be primarily hardscaped, and may be used for outdoor dining and other commercial activities.
- As building height increases, the buildings should consider the relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. A variety of techniques will be

implemented to mitigate any potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping.

Right-of-Way Dedication: Dedication of Right-of-Way may be required to accommodate public improvements.

Screening: All development on parcels abutting properties in “R” districts shall be permanently screened in the setback area with the combination of a solid screen and landscape screening. The solid screen shall consist of a wall or fence at least 6’ in height and maintained in good condition without any advertising thereon. Supporting members for walls or fences shall be installed so as not to be visible from any other property which adjoins or faces the fences or walls. This shall not apply to walls or fences with vertical supporting members designed to be identical in appearance on both sides. Landscape screening shall consist of one of the following options at a minimum:

- One large evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 40’ or greater for every 20 linear feet, plus one medium evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 10 linear feet. Evergreen trees shall be at least 6’ in height at the time of planting. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.
- One large deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 50’ or greater for every 25 linear feet, plus one medium deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 15 linear feet. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

Equipment: Exterior service, utility, trash, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings if possible and screened from view with a wall, fence or landscaping. Such equipment shall be completely screened from view. Materials shall be consistent with those used in the building and/or site. Equipment located on buildings shall match the color of the building.

Tract Coverage: A maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.

Pedestrian Access: Sidewalks with a minimum width of 5’, Recreation Paths with a minimum width of 10’, or a combination of both shall be provided along all Rights-of-Way. Pedestrian connections from Sidewalks, Recreation Paths and parking lots to building entrances shall be provided.

Landscaping: There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.

- Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.
- Deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2” caliper at the time of installation; evergreen trees shall be a minimum of 6’ in height at the time of installation; and shrubs shall be a minimum of 24” in height at the time of installation.
- Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.
- Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.

- The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.

Building Design:

- A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road (or High Street), or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.
- The height of a building shall be a minimum of 18' for flat roof buildings measured to the top of the parapet, or 12' for pitched roof buildings measured to the eave.
- Extensive blank walls that detract from the experience and appearance of an active streetscape should be avoided.
- Building Frontage that exceeds a width of 50' shall incorporate articulation and offset of the wall plane to prevent a large span of blank wall and add interest to the facade.
- Details and materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities to the building.
- Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.
- When designing for different uses, an identifiable break between the building's ground floors and upper floors shall be provided. This break may include a change in material, change in fenestration pattern or similar means.
- Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest should be used.
- Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view on all four sides to the height of the equipment. The materials used in screening must be architecturally compatible with the rooftop and the aesthetic character of the building.

Materials:

- Any new building or redevelopment of a building façade should include, at a minimum, 75% of materials consisting of full set clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding. Samples must be provided.
- Vinyl siding and other less durable materials should not be used.
- Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
- The material palette should provide variety and reinforce massing and changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
- Especially durable materials on ground floor façades should be used.
- Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.
- A variety of textures that bear a direct relationship to the building's massing and structural elements to provide visual variety and depth should be provided.
- The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

Windows and Doors:

- Ground-floor window and door glazing shall be transparent and non-reflective. Above the ground floor, both curtain wall and window/door glazing shall have the minimum reflectivity needed to achieve energy efficiency standards. Non-reflective coating or tints are preferred.
- Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building's architectural style.

- For a primary building frontage of a commercial use, a minimum of 30% of the area between the height of 2' and 10' above grade shall be in clear window glass that permits a full, unobstructed view of the interior to a depth of at least 4'.

Lighting: All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

- The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.
- The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.
- For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.
- Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

Signs:

Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

- Freestanding Signs
 - There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more than two freestanding signs on parcels 2 acres in size or greater.
 - Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10'. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape.
 - Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.
 - Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.
- Wall-mounted Signs
 - Each business occupying 25% or more of a building may have one wall sign and one projection sign. Wall-mounted signs shall not exceed 40 square feet in area, and projection signs shall not exceed 12 square feet in area per side.
 - Wall-mounted and projection signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

Parking:

- Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed 125% of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.
- Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.

Public Spaces: A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of multi-family dwellings, commercial or industrial space that is new in the WBC. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

- An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of 250 square feet;
- Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of 16 inches in height and 48 inches in width;
- Public art;
- Decorative planters;
- Bicycle racks;
- Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
- Decorative waste receptacles;
- Decorative pedestrian lighting; and
- Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies 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.

Staff Analysis and Recommendation:

1. The proposed plan reflects a less intense use of the site.
2. Connection with a traffic signal at the mall intersection should provide a good solution for getting traffic to and from the site.
3. Right-of-way vacation along both streets is shown and conforms to the request of the City.
4. Staff is recommending tabling of this application after discussion to allow the applicant to add information and detail based on the guidelines and any recommendations made at the meeting.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ohm Patel, 600 Enterprise Dr., Lewis Center, Ohio, said he was representing the Witness Group. Mr. Patel said there have been some overall changes to the plan. He said there were multiple driving factors as to why they made changes. He said they received a lot of feedback from potential tenants but parking has been a real challenge. Mr. Ohm said they wanted to have an Easton village like feel, with parking tucked in the back, but the tenants told him they need to have parking in front of their spaces. Mr. Patel said he did a feasibility study to see what is happening in the greater Columbus hotel market and how that would affect their hotel market. They found out there are approximately 700 rooms slated to come to the Polaris area with the same happening in Dublin, Ohio. He said the cost to build has also changed dramatically within the last three years from when they began the project. They had to decide which brand of hotel to keep so they decided on the number one brand in the nation which is the

Page 8 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting October 12, 2017

Minutes

Hampton Inn and Suites because the chain demands the best corporate clientele and they are number one in customer satisfaction and consistency. Mr. Patel said getting a Hampton Inn flag is very difficult because the chain is one of the most sought after brands. He said they have not officially applied for the franchise but have received a nod for when their site plan is approved so they can apply formally. They will be including three to four thousand square feet of meeting space and focusing on a boutique type of clientele with the ability to bring in an outside caterer to do some smaller events. Mr. Patel said from a financing standpoint, with so much supply coming in, banks are becoming hesitant to do a lot of hotel loans. The new hotel will have one hundred and eleven rooms. The average rate now is about \$68.00 per night, and the new hotel will rent rooms for \$120.00 plus per night. The other change will be the High Street building. He said they are now in a better position parking wise and based on preliminary traffic studies they are also seeing a dramatic decrease in the amount of traffic at the site. Along with the hotel they felt restaurants and professional services would be a good fit. Mr. Patel said the hotel will have a Wilson Bridge Road address and will direct people to the signaled light. There will only be one hotel, because two hotels would have increased their need for more parking. The office tenants on the second floor of the High Street building, in terms of what revenue is going to come in, did not justify the development costs and also the tenants are also pushing back on having an office above them. Mr. Patel said he received a lot of feedback from the local community of how the area will look and feel with the alignment of other buildings. He said they have interested tenants and they know what the mix will be, but he will be meeting with city staff next week to discuss having a second story. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Patel if had spoken with other businesses along High Street and Mr. Patel replied, no, but he has spoken with residents on the west side of High Street and they do not want the hotel to have a second story. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak.

Ms. Kay Keller, 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said she has an ongoing concern about the setback of the High Street building. She said she appreciated the hotel owner of being mindful of addressing the massiveness had there been a two-story building so close to High Street. Ms. Keller felt the building would stick out like a sore thumb if the building did not have green space in the front.

Ms. Maureen Nelson, 277 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she missed the meetings this past spring but was happy to be able to attend the meeting this meeting. She said she appreciated the map and layout so she could visualize the impending changes, and was delighted there will only be one hotel instead of two. Ms. Nelson said the Wilson Bridge Road entrance and exit seemed narrower than those on the opposite side and wondered if that would cause more congestion of getting in and out from the site. She said she was also concerned about the setback and thought there should be more landscaping in front of the High Street building since that area is a gateway to Worthington. She felt a two-story building would be too towering so close to High Street. She asked if all of the entrances would be attractive and what the current hotel occupancy of the hotel is.

Mr. Coulter explained the application would be tabled and the applicant was not looking for a vote this evening. He said the Board has similar questions still needing to be answered. A traffic study

will need to be done to address both entrances to see how they will work. Mr. Coulter said he was happy to see a realignment to co-inside with the mall to bring people to a traffic light. He said as far as the building is concerned, the Board is very strict with foresighted architecture and the prominence along High Street and Wilson Bridge Road, so the sides of the buildings will also have to be architecturally significant. Once the schemes are changed, everybody will have the opportunity to make comments. She also asked what the timeline would be for the beginning of construction. Mr. Patel responded they are hoping to get the approval by April or May 2018 and the Holiday Inn flag will be removed at the end of July 2018 so they hope to begin construction in August or early September 2018 and they expect an eighteen month construction time phase. The hotel will be built first before the outlying buildings because the retail buildings will take less time to build. Mr. Patel said he hopes to open everything at the same time. Mr. Coulter urged everyone to frequently look at the City's website for updates.

Mr. Brown said in addition, on the city's website, people can sign up for the news blast called "Notify Me" so people can request additional notification on specific projects, ARB, MPC, BZA, or City Council Agendas. Mrs. Bitar updates the project page frequently.

Mr. Dave Robinson, 195 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, thanked Mr. Patel for the progress on the project, and believed he was going in a wonderful direction. Mr. Robinson asked for someone to point out on the map where the edge of the Fifth Third building sat so he could visualize how the new building would break a precedent with setback. Mrs. Bitar answered Mr. Robinson's question.

Ms. Heather Monroe, 135 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, Ohio, asked about the pedestrian walkway and Mr. Brown explained the walkway will be realigned to follow along driveway and people can safely cross at the intersection.

Mr. Steve Rosandich, 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said his home is a buffer to their neighborhood. He asked if the walkway would require a variance and Mrs. Bitar said there will be an easement across the Villa Charmante property and there have been negotiations to accomplish that. Mr. Rosandich said he wanted to discuss sewage, water and drainage and asked who would be responsible for making sure that is done correctly. He said for the past twenty years he has lived in Worthington, the sewage, water and drainage have not been addressed and is totally unsatisfactory the way it is now. Mr. Brown explained the City's Engineer has hired a consultant for storm water to help make sure the situation is addressed and to dramatically improve the whole area. Mr. Rosandich said every time there is construction in the area, he is the one that pays the price because the neighboring property owner does not monitor their storm water and drainage. He said when the hotel owner had an issue with drainage causing an erosion problem, they changed the flow of the water and ran the water over his property and that destroyed his property. Mr. Brown said the developer will have to follow stringent guidelines, and new storm water technology is available now. Mr. Coulter told Mr. Rosandich there were three members of City Council in the audience listening to what he was saying.

Mrs. Jane Rosandich, 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, felt the entrance area to the mall was too narrow and believes traffic will back up into her neighborhood. Mr. Coulter said they have to wait to see the results from the traffic study.

Mr. Foust said he had a question regarding parking, and the site is short of seventy spaces of parking and asked if there would be adequate parking. No answer was given.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, Ohio, asked what the physical requirements were to get a Hampton Inn flag. Mr. Patel said in order to get a Hampton Inn flag you must have your rooms within four floors. He said they need to get a variance before they can apply for the flag.

Ms. Judy Neale, 6724 Schreiner St. W., Worthington, Ohio, said she would rather see a three-story hotel built than a four story and that would help the lack of parking space because there would be less traffic. She asked what tenants were interested in the spaces and asked the developer to be mindful of what restaurants are nearby and at the mall.

Mr. Jack Reynolds, and attorney for Smith and Hale asked for the application to be tabled.

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

2. Directional Signs – **644-654 High St.** (DeRoberts Family Limited Partnership) **AR 58-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property includes a building housing six merchant spaces (RIDEhome, ELLI Nail Spa, The Candle Lab, House Wine and Graeter's; A Taste of Vietnam has closed.), and the parking lot in front at the northeast corner of High St. and E. New England Ave. In 2015, two 18" high x 30" wide, double-sided, directional signs were installed and approved near the parking lot entrances identifying the lot as parking allowed only when visiting those tenants. Reportedly, the merchants expressed frustration with their customers not being able to park in the adjacent lot due to others using the lot. The parking lot appears to be a public lot to many downtown visitors, although it is private property.

This request is for approval of additional directional signs.

Project Details:

1. Signs have been installed at four of the easternmost parking spaces in front of the building designating the spaces be used for "15 Minute Parking for Customers of 644-654 High St." In recent years, fifteen minute parking was allowed adjacent to the property in the E. New England Ave. right-of-way.
2. The signs are 12" high x 10" wide white metal signs with black lettering and a red border.

They are mounted on round metal posts with flexible bases.

3. Variances would be needed if the signs stay as is because they are higher than the 36” allowed by Code for directional signs. The applicant is planning to lower the signs so the total height is 36”.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Sign Code

“Directional sign” means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. Two merchants have made an argument for the signs and claim it has helped business. There is no longer a concern about height if the signs are no higher than 36”. With cars in the parking lot, they should not be visible from High St.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donnie Austin, 644 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said he was representing House Wine, and they have had success with the new parking signs for their carry-out business. Mr. Sauer said the signs make sense and lowering them to three feet also makes sense. Mr. Sauer asked if the poles could be painted so they are not just galvanized pipe. Mr. Austin said they will be lowering the signs, and if the Board wants them to be painted he is okay with that. Mr. Hofmann said he appreciates the fifteen minute parking spots, but wondered if there could be a bollard or paint the spaces to make the spots feel more permanent, such as a handicap parking. He felt the galvanized signs would eventually get damaged and need to be replaced. Mr. Austin said there is a painted handicap space to the north, but often gets ignored because people have a difficult time seeing the painted space. Mrs. Lloyd said when the parking lot gets full it would be hard for people to see anything else. She said she is fine with the signs being lowered. Mrs. Holcombe agreed with Mrs. Lloyd. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DEROBERTS FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE AT 650 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 58-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 58-17, DATED JUNE 30, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, nay; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Signage - 910 High St. (Signcom Inc./PetPeople) AR 64-17 (Request for Reconsideration)

Mr. Reis moved to reconsider AR 64-17, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, "Aye."

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

Mr. Reis moved to reconsider ADP 05-17, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye."

a. Signage - 910 High St. (Signcom Inc./PetPeople) ADP 05-17 (Request for Reconsideration)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

At the last meeting, the ARB and MPC approved signs consisting of 24" high green panels with white lettering. The applicant did not think that would be effective, so would now like approval for 2 signs consisting of individually mounted 24" high white lettering (see drawings dated 9/19/17). The illumination would still be external. Approval of the Amendment to Development Plan would need to be by the City Council due to the placement of a second wall sign. Staff issued a Temporary Use Permit to allow the signs to be placed until approval of the permanent signs could be granted.

Previous details:

Two buildings were approved at this location south of the CVS building in 2007 when CVS was approved, and revised in 2016. Construction is nearing completion, and PetPeople is planning to move into the northern building.

Project Details:

1. The applicant would like to install a sign over the High St. entrance and a sign over the parking lot entrance. A variance is needed to have more than one wall mounted sign.

Page 13 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting October 12, 2017

Minutes

2. The proposed High St. sign would be 16' wide x 2'6" high, with the rear being 15' wide x 2'6" high. Placement of the front sign is proposed centered on the fascia; the rear sign is shown over a brick detail.
3. Construction would be of HDU (high density urethane), with ½" high raised borders and graphics. The background color is proposed as green (PMS #7496) and the border and lettering would be white.

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. 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.

Recommendation:

Staff feels two wall mounted signs are appropriate for this building given the two entrances, and the style now proposed is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ronald Dee, Director of Real Estate Construction for Pet People, 6950 Worthington-Galena Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Dee said he worked with City staff to come up with what they believe is an acceptable solution for signage on the building to get the visibility they feel is necessary and adequate on High Street. He felt the signs on the building were very attractive. The signs represent their brand and their business while remaining fairly neutral in terms of just being white and black and they also get the height and width of the letters that will make the signs more legible. He said he heard the recommendations last time at the previous meeting, but by the time they reduced the height of the actual plot sign to the required height the letters became very small and illegible. Mr. Dee said the sign is necessary for their business to be successful in Worthington.

Mr. Hofmann and Mrs. Holcombe both felt the sign and building looked nice. Mr. Dee said they were thrilled with the way the architecture turned out and the streetscape is still under construction. Mr. Sauer said he liked the signage without the plaque but was still of the opinion the sign is too large. Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar if the sign was within guidelines and Mrs. Bitar replied yes. Mr. Dee said they hope to open within the next two weeks. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

Page 14 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting October 12, 2017

Minutes

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM INC. ON BEHALF OF PETPEOPLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL WALL SIGNS AT 910 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, nay; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM INC. ON BEHALF OF PETPEOPLE TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PROPERTY AT 910 HIGH ST. BY INSTALLING WALL SIGNS AS PER CASE NO. ADP 05-17, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 05-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Architectural Review Board - New

1. Barn Restoration – **63 W. Granville Rd.** (Megan Shroy) **AR 81-17** (Extension of AR 63-15)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This application was originally approved by the ARB in September of 2015. The owners picked up the permit to construct the garage, but did not pick up the barn permit and the approval has expired. Approval of this request would extend the ARB approval for an additional 18 months so a permit could be issued to complete the work. The details of the project have not changed.

This late 19th century Colonial Revival home is on a corner lot that is roughly 0.4 acres, with 126.12' of frontage along W. Granville Rd. and 134.86' along Oxford St. The house faces W. Granville Rd. and there is a drive entrance at Oxford St. leading to the rear yard and a barn. Both

the house and barn are contributing structures in the Worthington Historic District. The owners would like to restore the barn, and construct a new garage at the southeast corner of the property.

Project Details:

1. An addition was constructed on the north side of the barn at some point to add depth for cars to park under cover. The owners cannot fit their vehicles inside due to the low height. The plan is to remove the addition and restore the barn by adding rolling barn doors, windows and light fixtures, and restoring and replacing the siding as necessary.
2. The driveway to get into the property is very steep and at an awkward angle. A new drive entrance is proposed that would be south of the existing, and with a gentler slope into the property. Stone retaining walls are proposed on both sides in order to accommodate the change in grade. The public sidewalk will also need to be replaced to meet the grade.
3. A three-car garage is proposed at the southeast corner of the property, 10' from the south property line and 8' from the east side property line. The new driveway would lead to the garage, widening to the full width of the garage about 30' in front. The proposed garage would be 38' 8" wide and 22' deep, and include a second floor space to be used as a home office. The Board of Zoning Appeals granted a variance to allow accessory structure area greater than 850 square feet at its September 3rd meeting. The garage is designed to complement the house. The roofline, dormers, windows, trim and materials would match the house.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character. New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. Restoration of the barn is ideal, as these structures are an important part of Worthington's character and this barn is in such a prominent location. The proposed new garage is appropriate for this property and house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Megan Shroy, 63 W. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said she received approval for this project two years ago, but did not like the loan rate she received so she decided to save the money for the project. She is ready to move forward with the project. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

Page 16 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting October 12, 2017

Minutes

THAT THE REQUEST BY MEGAN SHROY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A NEW GARAGE AND RESTORE THE BARN AT 63 W. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-15, DATED JULY 21, 2015, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Modifications to Approved Renovations – **25 W. New England Ave.** (Michelle Bishop) **AR 72-17** (Amendment to AR 42-17)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story commercial building was constructed in the late 1930's on a 50' x 135' parcel, which is in the C-5 Zoning District. The building covers most of the lot, with some greenspace in the front and a sidewalk along the west side. It is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The building was reportedly constructed as a switch station, but was used most recently as office space, with the Worthington Chamber of Commerce occupying the first floor. The new owner, CBRS Worthington LLC, purchased the building at the end of 2016 and is planning to renovate the structure for use as the office for Datafield Technology Services.

The ARB approved an application at its June 8, 2017 meeting to replace and add windows, add a front porch and balcony; and modify entrances. This application is a request to construct a modified front façade.

Project Details:

1. The front façade is now proposed without a balcony. Also, the change from three bays to a five bays is now proposed, with five windows across the second floor and four windows plus the center entry on the first floor. The first floor porch would remain the same as previously approved.
2. The proposed windows are fixed 12-light black aluminum windows with 3-light transoms above on the first floor only. All of the windows would have brick lintels.
3. The entrance has been modified to have a single column of sidelights on each side. Light fixtures have been eliminated from the front of the building.
4. Other renovation details would not change.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Compatibility of design and materials and exterior details and relationships are standards for review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed modifications are appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Michelle Bishop, 560 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said she was representing CBRS Worthington LLC, the owner of the building. Mr. Tim Randolph, 653 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he also works for CBRS Worthington LLC. Ms. Bishop said when she came before the Board the first time, she had proposed adding a balcony based on the initial structural engineering report, but they did not receive the final report until this past July 2017 and that report was much more involved than they had originally expected and the cost was prohibitive to their budget. They have also switched general contractors and pulled back on some other things, one of which is to reduce the balcony. They feel the balcony is more in line with other balconies in town such as the Orange Johnson and Snow Houses.

Mr. Reis said he liked the elevation better and thought the look was cleaner. Mr. Hofmann said there was an indication of a beltline in the drawing and thought the raised brick detail looked very nice. Ms. Bishop said she had some concerns with Mr. Hofmann's idea because the windows might get in the way. There will not be very much brick between the windows and she felt that might make the building look like it was cut in half. Mrs. Holcombe asked if they were using the existing façade, and Mr. Randolph said yes, for the most part, but they may end up using all new brick in order to get everything to match. Ms. Bishop said when they removed the porch, and a door, they added three windows to balance the façade. Mr. Hofmann asked if the drawing was to scale and Mr. Randolph said no, he did not believe the architect's drawing was to scale because there is less brick in between the windows. Mr. Randolph said the building will look similar to the Snow House when completed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHELLE BISHOP ON BEHALF OF CBRS WORTHINGTON LLC TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 42-17 BY MODIFYING THE FRONT ELEVATION FOR THE RENOVATIONS AT 25 W NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 72-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 72-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

3. Landscaped Area - **2204 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (United Dairy Farmers) **AR 75-17**
(Amendment to AR 128-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

A new UDF convenience store and gas station at the northeast corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. was approved by the Architectural Review Board in September of 2014, and the opened in July of this year. The development is on 2 adjacent parcels, 1 located in Columbus and 1 in Worthington. Both jurisdictions approved plans for the new station. In addition to the ARB approval, the parcel in Worthington was rezoned to the C-4 Zoning District, and a Conditional Use Permit and variances were granted to accommodate the use. The total lot size for the 2 parcels after right-of-way dedication and transfer of a portion on the north side to Linworth Baptist Church is about 1.5 acres. The Worthington lot was home to a bank building and the old UDF was entirely on the Columbus parcel.

This request is for a modification to the landscape plan to accommodate and screen a utility.

Project Details:

1. There is a manhole near the northeast corner of the site that is faced with landscape block to accommodate the grade difference. The applicant decided to continue that block wall to the corner of the property to make for a more aesthetically pleasing transition to the adjacent condominium and church properties. Hosta and Pachysandra plants were added to give a finished look to the area.
2. The applicant agreed to the plan with the neighbors before constructing. A letter of support from the Strathaven Condominium association is included with the application.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate for relatively small spaces and provides relief from the hardscape. Fences and walls can also be used and are strongly encouraged as effective screening for utilities.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the finished landscaping and screening is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Kessler, Attorney representing United Dairy Farmers, 411 E. Town St., Columbus, Ohio, thanked Mrs. Bitar for her presentation, and said plantings have also been added to the site. Both neighbors, the church and the neighbors at Strathaven are both in support of the project. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present either for or against to speak regarding this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY UNITED DAIRY FARMERS, INC. TO AMEND AR #128-16 WITH A CHANGE TO THE LANDSCAPING/HARDSCAPING AT 2182 WEST DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 75-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 75-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- 4. Building Demolition and Sign Modification – **445 E. Granville Rd.** (Step by Step Academy) **AR 73-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Harding Hospital was founded in 1916 by George T. Harding II, MD as the Columbus Rural Rest Home. The hospital provided treatment for people with physical, mental, social and spiritual needs on the 45 acre Worthington campus until 1999, when it became part of The Ohio State University’s Wexner Medical Center. In 2014, Step by Step academy purchased the property and has been providing mental health services out of some of the buildings on the property. Many of the buildings have not been used or maintained in years.

This application is a second request to demolish building E, which is a Tudor style building that was constructed in 1928 and is on the northwest part of the campus adjacent to Rush Creek. Also, approval to modify a freestanding sign is requested.

Project Details:

- 1. Demolition:
 - On June 22, 2017, the ARB heard the request to demolish buildings D, E, and F, but did not approve building E. The Board asked for more information regarding the condition. A more detailed report of the failures of the roof and ceiling, and

extensive water damage to walls, soffits, and floor joists was received from a structural engineering firm.

- The applicant reports the building has not been maintained in over 25 years, was not used for many years prior, is in disrepair and is not able to be renovated. Pictures were submitted showing the current state of the building. Interior damage appears extensive.
- Grass seed is planned for the site after demolition.
- Both the Divisions of Police and Fire are aware of the building and feel it is a hazard. The fire chief has been inside and reports interior collapses, exposure to the elements and vandalism as contributing to the damage. Both support demolition of the structure.

2. Sign:

- There is a freestanding sign near E. Granville Rd. consisting of a post, frame and roof structure. Currently there are no sign faces; the last faces had a white background and The Ohio State University Medical Center logo and address.
- This request is to install new 41" X 41" sign faces with a white background, brown address, and tree branch decorations. Also, the applicant would like to remove the roof structure.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

Demolition is final. Because it is an irreversible act, full or partial demolition must be carefully considered before any decision is made. A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington's character; and plans for the site following demolition.

- Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.
- For projects in which demolition of an older structure is proposed, the applicant should contact the City of Worthington as early as possible. The city may be able to help with evaluating alternatives to demolition. In all cases where demolition is proposed, applicants should be prepared to explain and to document the financial and technical reasons why it is not feasible to accomplish their goals while retaining the existing building.
- It may be acceptable to demolish an older building that has been so altered over the years that its integrity is low and it has lost most or all of its historic character. This does not, however, always apply, since even altered buildings can sometimes be important placeholders along the streetscape. Because of age or design, some building additions may be nearly as important as an original building. Removing these elements might affect the building's character, and this should be taken into account when demolition is proposed.
- Demolition to create parking lots should be avoided, particularly along the dense streetscape of High Street. Loss of buildings here would permanently alter the character of the whole district.

- Demolition to combine lots for larger developments is strongly discouraged. Small-scale buildings on closely-spaced sites characterize much of Worthington's older areas. Assembly of land in these areas for large lots and construction of large buildings, especially involving demolition of existing structures, is not appropriate.
- When full or partial demolition of an existing structure is proposed, the applicant should be prepared to present detailed plans for the replacement building. Demolition may not proceed until it has been determined that the structure conforms to the new construction design guidelines.

Architectural District Ordinance

- Whenever a building within the District is proposed to be demolished, partially demolished or removed, an application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be filed with the City Clerk as provided in this chapter. Such application shall set forth the intent to demolish.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall hear the request not sooner than twelve days nor later than sixty days from the date the application is filed and shall advertise such hearing to provide time for public comment. The Board may request a statement from the City's Division of Building Regulation on the structural condition of the building and the conformity of the building to applicable building codes. In addition, the Board may request at the City's expense a written statement concerning the proposed demolition by a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. Such statement shall be taken into consideration in determining the appropriateness of the request. The applicant may provide at his or her expense any evidence or testimony from a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. The Board of Architectural Review shall act on the request not later than thirty days after the initial hearing on the application. The applicant may waive this requirement by filing with the Director of Planning and Building a written statement waiving the right to have his or her application acted upon within such thirty-day period.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall determine by a vote of its members whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness based on the determination:
 - That such building is not historically or architecturally significant;
 - That if the building is found to be historically or architecturally significant, there is no feasible or prudent alternative or change that would allow preservation of the building; and
 - The proposal for grading, landscaping and other design treatment once the structure is removed meets the standards of this chapter.
 - In any circumstance, the Board shall not deny a request for a certificate of appropriateness if it determines either:
 - o That such denial will deny all reasonable use of the property or
 - o That such denial shall result in an unsafe condition because of the structural or physical condition of the building.
- No building shall be demolished or removed in the Architectural Review District without the owner or his or her representative first obtaining a certificate of appropriateness approving such removal or demolition, unless such building presents an immediate danger

to public health and safety in the opinion of the City's Chief Building Official, in which event, the Chief Building Inspector may order removal or demolition of such building in order to protect public health and safety.

- The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination).

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. Although it is never desirable to demolish early twentieth century buildings, the condition of the building has been reported as unsafe, and no feasible or prudent alternative has been presented that would allow preservation. The whole property is in the Architectural Review District, but this building cannot be seen from E. Granville Rd. due to distance, grade and vegetation. The sign changes are appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Lorie Sontag, 6631 Eastland Ct., Westerville, Ohio; Mr. Michael Mayhew, 995 Lori Lane, Westerville, Ohio; Dr. Patrick Maynard, 4900 Olentangy Blvd., Columbus, Ohio. Mrs. Sontag said their engineer issued a more extensive report this past summer with details about the water damage and to restore the place would be an economic hardship for their organization, so they would like permission to demolish the building. Mrs. Holcombe said she hoped the building could have been saved but understands the building is in disrepair. Mr. Sauer said the first time he saw the building he knew there was no hope. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Ron Sears, 500 Park Overlook Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he was in support of the project and Step By Step has been the best neighbor in the past thirty-seven years. He said he appreciated their involvement with the community and the stakeholder research they have done. Mr. Sears said he trusts the organization, but he had one request and that was to protect the quality, safety and property values of Colonial Hills. He said the Colonial Hills area is a kid friendly community which could be easily destroyed with an increase of traffic. He discussed some of the history of the Academy's property and said there have been problems in the past, but not the fault of the new owners. Mr. Sears said he wanted to make sure Colonial Hills remained a kid friendly community, and to keep the quality of their neighborhood. He also wanted to make sure the gate to Academy's property remained locked at all times. Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the back ground history Mr. Sears discussed, and said the new owners of the property have been very good about working with the community and they will continue to do so. Mr. Brown explained to Mr. Sears the City's website has a project information page, and notices are emailed to people who sign up for additional information. Mr. Sears said the City's Comprehensive Plan, which was updated in

2005, discussed the gated property and the potential for development. He wanted to know how that specific language could be extracted from the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Myers explained he lives two blocks away from Mr. Sears, and two other City Council members who were present at the meeting, also live very close to him. The long range development plan is just a guideline and not the Code. The plan is something they look at for future projects. Mr. Myers said the Academy's property has always been viewed as a developable property, but he knows of three City Council members who would vote no to such development on that site. Mr. Foust said he appreciated Mr. Sears's comments and that comments are needed so the owners know the wishes of the nearby community and that the gate needs to remain closed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one else came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE STEP BY STEP ACADEMY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH BUILDING E AND MODIFY A FREESTANDING SIGN AT 445 E. GRANVILLE RD. (SIGN #2) AS PER CASE NO. AR 73-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 73-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 20, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Pergola – **93 W. Granville Rd.** (Leslie & Matt Welch) **AR 77-17**

Mrs. Bitar said the applicant requested to have this item tabled. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, "Aye."

6. Wall Sign – **5596 N. High St.** (Over the Counter) **AR 74-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This neighborhood shopping center was built in 1953, with the northern part of the building being in the City of Worthington and the remainder in the City of Columbus. The space formerly occupied by Colonial Music and Nicklaus Drugs straddles the jurisdictional line, and is now occupied by Collage Salons and Over the Counter restaurant.

This application is a request for approval of a sign for Over the Counter.

Project Details:

1. As with the Collage Salon sign next door, this proposed sign was designed to be similar to the original Nicklaus Drugs signage. The sign is proposed above the mounting banner.
2. The sign is proposed with a teal background and white lettering. A logo consisting of a red laboratory flask and yellow bubbles is also proposed.
3. The perimeter of the sign panel and the word "RESTAURANT" would be illuminated at night with exposed white neon. The flask would have red neon and the bubbles yellow neon.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination).

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed wall sign would be appropriate due to the center's design and the history of signage at this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Creighton, 3860 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Creighton had no comments and Board members had no concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and one person came forward. Mr. David Robinson thought the new sign looked cool. He asked how tall the letters were in comparison to the Pet People sign. Mrs. Bitar said Mr. Creighton's letters were probably less than twenty inches in height. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID CREIGHTON ON BEHALF OF OVER THE COUNTER RESTAURANT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SIGN AT 5596 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 74-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 74-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

7. Demolition & New House – **155 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Schumacher Homes/ Tschofen)
AR 76-17

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This parcel was established in 1957 as part of the Kilbourne Village subdivision. The existing 1740 square foot split-level house was constructed in 1960. This is a request to demolish the existing house and construct a new 2400 square foot single-story residence.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan:

- The proposed house would be constructed in approximately the same location as the existing house, but extend further to the rear. The existing house is situated 51' from the front property line; 7' from the west property line; 10.7' from the east property line; and ~93' from the rear. The proposed house would be the same distance from the front and west property lines; ~10.2' from the east property line; and ~64.1' from the rear. The garage would extend in front of the house by a few feet.
- A landscaping plan has not been included with the application, but would be needed.

2. Building:

- Proposed is a one-story structure with a hipped roof. Gables are proposed above the garage and front entrance, and a shed roof dormer is proposed on the front of the roof.
- White vinyl siding is proposed around the entire house with board and batten style shown for the front elevation and Dutch lap siding for the sides and rear. The two front gables would have siding that looks like shakes, and the gable around the front door is proposed with white washed brick. Pewter colored dimensional asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof. Photographs of the materials and samples have been provided and will be available at the meeting.
- Vinyl clad wood Andersen windows are proposed on the front and rear of the house. On the front the windows would be double hung with 4 over 4 lights, and the center two windows would have transoms above. The rear windows are proposed as single-paned windows and an egress window is proposed from the basement on the east end. The only side windows are glass block basement windows and a small rectangular window on the west side at the top of the wall. A steel or fiberglass mahogany textured front door is proposed. The door is shown in the elevation with 6 lights above a panel, sidelights, and a transom. A white carriage style garage door with vertically oriented panels is proposed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington's character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for new structures?)

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.

Building placement and orientation are important design considerations. There are two primary considerations: 1) most main entrances should face the street; and 2) garages should avoid facing the street. The City of Worthington wants to avoid new development that turns main entrances inward or away from the street, and it wants to avoid dominance of the streetscape by garage doors.

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: 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.

Recommendation:

The proposed house has a more modern appearance than the surrounding homes due to the massing and materials, but has features similar to other houses in Kilbourne Village. Design with a gabled roof, some use of natural materials, or use of one siding material may allow the new house to be more compatible with the surrounding structures. Although it is typical for garage doors to face the street in this area, having the garage closer to the street than the house is not preferred. A single story house would be more accessible than the existing split-level. A landscape plan is needed.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Pete Tschofen, 5499 Heathrow Dr., Powell, Ohio, 43065, said he is the new owner of 155 W. Dublin-Granville Road. Also with Mr. Tschofen were: Mr. Joe Young, 8573 Leader Dr., Galloway, Ohio (Schumacher Homes); and Mr. Tyler Palmer, 68 Sterling Ridge Dr., Delaware, Ohio (Schumacher Homes). Mr. Tschofen said when he first purchased the home he was just going to do some renovation work, but after he started working with an architect he decided he wanted this to be his forever home so he chose to have a ranch.

Mr. Foust explained there are some communities in the area where neighbors work closely together to keep some consistency and protect what they have, such as the Rush Creek area and Colonial Hills. He said the Kilbourne Village area is a little different, the area is about ten to fifteen years younger than some of the other neighborhoods. There were three builders that built all of the homes in the area with half a dozen different styles and a lot of different variations on how those were put together. Mr. Foust asked what should be done with that particular part of the corridor. Should houses that are fifty to sixty years old be replaced? Should all of the houses along the State Route 161 corridor look the same? He said he did not believe there was a group that banded together to keep a particular look for the area and asked the Board members what the game plan is for State Route 161. Mr. Reis believed within five to six years a lot of the houses nearby would be replaced with new homes such as what is happening in Upper Arlington. Postage stamp houses are being torn down with million dollars homes being built on the lots. Mrs. Holcombe felt this particular area would be okay for building a new house and a ranch would be more desirable than

a split level. Mr. Coulter explained they should look at the houses on a case by case basis, and he agreed with Mrs. Holcombe there is a shortage of ranch style homes in the area. He said the style of the house is similar to other houses in the neighborhood and he did not feel the new home would be a distraction.

Mr. Coulter was pleased to hear Mr. Tschofen spoke with the neighbors and none of the neighbors had any objections. Mr. Sauer said he recognized this will probably be a trend that continues and expands, and the Board will likely see more of this going on. He said he would not stop the process, but what he would look for is the project to be done well, and was given the same thought, consideration and care that a lot of the other homes have. Mr. Sauer said he would look at the character, the materials, to make sure the house is being done in a well-crafted way and not just thrown up quickly. Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed with Mr. Sauer. Mr. Hofmann said he had a counterpoint, not criticizing, but on Evening Street there was a couple who wanted to expand their home but there was a large amount of opposition to the expansion, so a decision was made not to change the overt character of that home. This project would change the overt character of this home. Mr. Hofmann he was struggling with the massiveness of the home and felt the front entry was out of character.

Mr. Sauer said the front elevation had a lot of detail but felt the sides were too plain, so he would like to see more three dimensional architecture with the details carried out to the sides of the home. Mr. Myers said the Architectural Review Board sets the standards for Worthington, and asked Mr. Tschofen if this house is the standard he wants to set for State Route 161. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Tschofen if he had given any thought to using more durable materials. Mr. Young said more people are turning to vinyl products for less maintenance. He said most people would not be able to tell the product is not wood. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Young how many other houses he has built in Worthington, and Mr. Young responded this would be his first house to build in Worthington. Mr. Myers explained the Board will strongly suggest more attention to the details which will probably increase the cost to build the home. Mr. Coulter said the Board members are very aware of foresighted architecture. If a particular window style is used in the front of the home, they would want to see the same style of window carried throughout all sides of the home. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, Ohio, said he would like Board to consider the resale value of the house. He referenced 511 Oxford Court and said the owners are having a difficult time trying to sell the house and they keep having to lower the price.

Mr. Brian Rood, 701 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he supports this project, and also supports new homes being built in the neighborhood. He said he represented the younger generation and has many friends that would like to move into the neighborhood.

Mr. Tschofen requested to table the application. Mr. Sauer moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, "Aye."

8. Mural – **644-654 High St.** (Mike Duffey) **AR 79-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property includes a building housing six merchant spaces (RIDEhome, ELLI Nail Spa, The Candle Lab, House Wine and Graeter's; A Taste of Vietnam has closed.), and the parking lot in front at the northeast corner of High St. and E. New England Ave. The rear wall of this building faces the municipal parking lot to the east, and is currently painted white, except the southern part is painted light green to match the other walls of House Wine. The meters and equipment on that part of the wall are painted to match, and there is conduit along the entire wall painted to match the background.

This request is for approval to paint a mural on the back (east) wall of the building.

Project Details:

1. No other murals have been installed in Old Worthington, and there is not reference to murals in the Worthington Design Guidelines.
2. The applicant is proposing Firefly Delight, which includes a picture of a young girl looking at fireflies in a jar, a dog, soccer ball, books, etc. set on a purple background. As an alternative, a picture of the mural in the Old Worthington library that depicts an historical scene is in the packet. The applicant would like to discuss the options with the ARB.
3. By definition, murals are signs. Either proposed mural would also need approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance from the requirement for no more than 4 colors.

Land Use Plans:

Code Chapter 1170 - Signs

1170.01 PURPOSE AND INTENT.

The purpose of these sign regulations is to encourage the proper development and use of signage and to permit and regulate signs in such a way as to support and complement land-use objectives set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. In addition to protecting from distractions and obstructions that can contribute to traffic and pedestrian accidents, it is the intent of these regulations to control and regulate signs to prevent them from becoming a nuisance factor to adjacent properties and the community in general. To protect the general health, safety and welfare, and to protect and encourage a more attractive economic, business and overall physical appearance of the community, all signage is subject to the regulations that follow in this chapter.

1170.02 DEFINITIONS AND PROVISIONS.

“Sign” means any device, structure, material or combination of these intended to advertise or draw attention to such items as business names, organization names, real estate, buildings or structures, products, services or entertainment.

1170.03 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

(d) Colors. Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Code Chapter 1177 - Architectural District

1177.01 PURPOSE.

The purpose of this chapter is to maintain a high character of community development, to protect and preserve property, to promote the stability of property values and to protect real estate from impairment or destruction of value for the general community welfare by regulating the exterior architectural characteristics of structures and preservation and protection of buildings of architectural or historical significance throughout the hereinafter defined Architectural District. It is the further purpose of this chapter to recognize and preserve the distinctive historical and architectural character of this community which has been greatly influenced by the architecture of an earlier period in this community's history. These purposes shall be served by the regulation of exterior design, use of materials, the finish grade line, landscaping and orientation of all structures hereinafter altered, constructed, reconstructed, erected, enlarged or remodeled, removed or demolished in the hereinafter defined Architectural District.

1177.05 STANDARDS FOR REVIEW: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.

The Board of Architectural Review, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness, shall determine that the application under consideration promotes, preserves and enhances the distinctive historical village character of the community and would not be at variance with existing structures within that portion of the district in which the structure is or is proposed to be located as to be detrimental to the interests of the Districts as set forth in Section [1177.01](#). In conducting its review, the Board shall make examination of and give consideration to the elements of the application including, but not necessarily limited to:

(10) Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter [1170](#), the appropriateness of signage to the building.

Worthington Design Guidelines

The City of Worthington has sign regulations, the purpose of which is to keep commercial signage from overwhelming the city's traditional architecture and its human scale. The regulations also address safety issues. The following guidelines are meant to be flexible and to work hand-in-hand with the sign regulations. They allow creativity and imagination in signage, while recommending against some practices that would not be appropriate in Worthington. Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but should avoid incompatible modern colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor of more subtle and toned-down shades.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommended tabling of this application so the City and community members have time to decide whether murals are appropriate for Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Mike Duffey, said he was representing the De Roberts Family LP, 646 High St., Worthington, Ohio. He explained they were not seeking the Board's immediate approval but they did want feedback. He realizes the public process, and the public notice process, and that public hearings allow for public input in many ways and he cannot get the feedback he needs until going through this process. Mr. Duffey said he grew up in Worthington in the Colonial Hills area, is a former Worthington City Council member, and currently serves as a State Representative for the State of Ohio. Mr. Duffey said Mrs. Bitar explained the City does not currently have guidelines for murals so they are wandering in the dark a bit to feel out what could work in the community and he understands and respects the process. He realized there are questions as to what the city can control, the content is more difficult than the substance and the size, and this project could be a precedent setting project. He said his project and the Le Chatelaine project with the Old Worthington Partnership would both violate the four color rule but the process should allow people to get to some level of comfort.

Mr. Duffey said in 2015 he had a conversation with the owner of House Wine about the blank wall in the back of his store and asked him if he ever considered a mural. Mr. Austin told him he thought about doing something like that, but never did anything to move forward with such a project. Mr. Duffey said he told Mr. Austin he would try to make something happen. Mr. Duffey said he has invested a lot of time talking with people, chasing down every neighbor, tenant, as well as funding. He said he felt good about the amount of research that had been done, and has submitted a signed petition to City Council regarding the acceptance of such mural. Mr. Duffey said he had spoken with most of the tenants of the shopping center and the home owners of the abutting properties and all were in favor of the mural project, including Ms. Carrie Showe, the General Manager of the Worthington Inn, and, Mr. Kevin Showe the owner of the former Masonic Lodge. Mr. Duffey said he also received the support of the owner of the building. He said a Facebook page was created for the project and they are up to sixty likes, and there have not been any negative comments yet. Mr. Duffey explained there are other art pieces around the community that did not go through the public process before installing public art in their yards such as the pregnant mermaid in the front yard of the McConnell Arts Center, and the MAC art piece in the front yard of a local insurance agency.

Mr. Duffey said he found a local artist named Kaitlyn Waters who went to Granby Elementary School in Worthington, graduated from Worthington Kilbourne, and then graduated from CCAD (Columbus College of Art and Design). He explained the project to the artist saying he wanted a design that was family friendly. The artist came up with a girl holding a jar of fire flies which she called a perfect summer night. Mr. Duffey said he would be seeking an Ohio Arts Council grant for the project. He said he has already spoken with their staff and they are receptive to the idea. Mr. Duffey also spoke with Jon Cook the Director of the McConnell Arts Center who encouraged him to get further public input. Mr. Duffey said he planned to have a public event

involving children at the Shops at Worthington Place, he's already received approval from Mr. Tom Carter, and he will hand out small canvases to children and ask them to paint of picture of something they love about summer. The event will be free, and the children will keep to their artwork. He said he would ask the parents to take a photo of the artwork and post the photo on the Mural Project's Facebook page. He said he would come back with a revised design with something the artist is inspired by after looking at a collection of the children's artwork, and come back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Duffey said he is not in any hurry to go through this process and believed painting on the building would not occur until next spring when the weather breaks. He hopes the project will be completed before the Worthington Arts Festival. He said he would like for there to be a question and answering session with the artist on the stage during the festival possibly with a power point presentation on the mural process and invite the high school kids so they can see what a professional artist does.

Mr. Coulter explained they do not want to get into the contextual language because this is a freedom of speech issue and there are Constitutional protections against that. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. David Robinson, no address was given, said he was impressed with the amount of work Mr. Duffey put into the project and thinking through all of the issues. He believed public art was an outstanding idea and thought both murals were pleasing, but thought the first mural should have some sort of historical reference but the second historical mural was rather boring. Mr. Robinson suggested opening up the mural idea as a contest to Worthington Schools, CCAD, Ohio State University and the general public. He thought prize money could be offered, and criteria be established such as aesthetically pleasing, historical references, expressing Worthington values and character, and feasibility of execution. Mr. Robinson believed something extraordinary could be developed for the historic district. He thought a judging panel could incorporate community groups that do not normally converse with one another such as the Old Worthington Partnership, the Old Worthington Association, and the Worthington Historical Society. He thought this could generate more discussion within the community, and if there were twelve murals a community calendar could be created to raise money.

Mr. Duffey said he appreciated the thoughtful comments, but that could be a dangerous precedent set because any private building that wants a mural could be a community judging decision. He said the Architectural Review Board (ARB) would no longer be able to control decisions, and if a person wanted new shingles on their roof, that would be a community decision, instead of a decision made by the ARB. He believed the right way to work on the project was to talk with the building owner, talk with the people who would be working on the project, and people directly involved in the line of sight. Mr. Duffey said he felt there would always be controversy over picking the people that would serve on the panel. He felt if the project was for a public wall, that would be a great process, but this building is owned by a private individual.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, Ohio, thought City Council should develop some guidelines for what should be done when a mural needs maintenance, or if the mural is allowed to be painted over. He also asked what the guidelines would be if someone wanted to paint a mural

on the side of their home and at what point will the answer be yes or no? He believed guidelines need to be established for clarification.

Mr. Brown said the new Law Director will be taking a look at these types of questions, but not regarding content, if murals are allowed they need to discuss all types of scenarios before moving forward.

Mr. Myers said this is like putting the cart before the horse. He said he liked the idea of a mural when first proposed in early 2000, but as a lawyer, he is always concerned about content restrictions. Once this is opened up for one, this will be opened up for all, so he would like to hear from the Law Director first before moving forward.

Ms. Kay Keller, 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said a lot of good important issues were raised. She said she was not opposed to the idea of a mural but she felt since the ARB already regulated how the historic district looked, there should be some regulation of murals within the district. She does not want to see a free for all, but she does appreciate public art such as a sculpture, but art covering the whole side of a wall is different. Ms. Keller felt the proposed rendering was whimsical and fun, but did not feel the look was appropriate for the historic district. She felt Mr. Duffey should speak with as many homeowners as possible because they may have a different perspective than the business owners.

Mr. Sauer said he believed the ARB should have some sort of control over murals, but he was not sure what that might be. Mr. Hofmann said public art brings richness to the community. He said there has been a long history of decorating walls, and painting signs on buildings and wondered if there was any precedent with other communities that would serve as a model of how an Arts Commission may have gotten involved or how control was established. Mrs. Bitar said there are such displays in nearby communities that needed revitalization such as older warehouse types of structures. She said the City of Westerville has a couple of murals in the Uptown area. Mr. Sauer said the other thing he struggles with, such as in downtown Columbus, are the large advertisements that run the length of the building and he would not want to see something like that in Worthington. Mr. Myers responded to Mr. Sauer's comments and said advertisements are commercial speech and they do not have the same type of protection as other forms of speech and commercial speech is fairly easy to regulate, but free speech is not.

Mr. Duffey requested to table the application. Mr. Reis moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye."

9. Renovation/Addition – **158 Medick Way** (Nicholson Builders Inc./Gasser) **AR 82-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Page 35 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting October 12, 2017

Minutes

The Medick Estate Subdivision was approved in 1950, creating Medick Way and Tucker Dr. This lot is at the northwest corner of Medick Way and Evening St., being one of three Medick Estates lots that are part of the Architectural Review District due to their adjacency to Evening St. The 2418 square foot one-story brick house on this lot was constructed in 1951 facing Medick Way, and has a driveway off of Evening St. to an attached garage. In 2008, a fence was approved and constructed along the east side of the house to enclose a patio area.

This project involves partial demolition of the existing house, construction of an addition and additional garage space, and total renovation.

Project Details:

1. The proposed finished project would be 1 ½ stories in the English Revival style, mainly built on the existing foundation. The new house would be 4067 square feet in area, with the majority of the living space on the first floor. A master suite is proposed for the western part of the structure, and offices are proposed at the front. A family room and the kitchen would be in the middle of the house, with a dining room, pantry and mudroom on the east side. At the front, stairs would lead to the second floor which would have 2 one-bedroom suites.
2. Building details:
 - A main gable is proposed to run east to west with nested gables at both ends. A cross gable toward the middle would accommodate the front entrance. Two shed roof dormers are proposed on the front of the main gable and one larger shed roof dormer is proposed on the rear of the house. On the rear, the house would extend between two hipped roofed structures, with living space on the east end and the attached garage on the west end. A new 22' x 22' detached garage designed to match the attached garage is proposed at the northeast corner of the lot.
 - The main material for the house would be stone. Samples have been provided. The side gables and sides of the dormers are proposed as a wood shake. Board and batten siding is proposed for the rear of the house and the northwest portion of the structure. Verification is needed as to whether the proposed siding and trim is wood or another material. Stone is proposed on the east side, including the garages. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof surfaces, but the exact design and color has not been identified.
 - Windows are proposed that appear to be casement style. The window structure would be black and have stone lintels and sills. Window and door catalogue cuts are needed.
 - Catalogue cuts are needed for the light fixtures proposed on the house.
3. Site:
 - A small expansion of the attached garage to the east would require a variance due to placement in the required 20' side yard. The detached garage would also extend the same distance into the required side yard due to the location of a 200 year old Oak tree at the rear of the property. Two stone pillars with a gate/fence would extend between the two structures.

- To the rear of the house a stone patio is proposed that would include an outdoor kitchen and fireplace. A fountain is proposed north of the patio and an arbor is shown. Details of all elements are needed.
- The owner would like to have additional parking available for guests, so is proposing an area to accommodate 3 cars adjacent to Medick Way. The area would likely be constructed with a pervious paver but the exact material has not been identified. A walk with stone surface is proposed between the parking area and the front door.
- A landscape plan is included that shows retention of existing vegetation, including the hedge along Evening St., and planting of a mix of shrubs, bushes and trees.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; and the impact of the demolition on Worthington’s character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for new structures?) Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community’s character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.

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

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended tabling of this application after discussion until the needed information is received. Although the look of the existing structure is changing, the proposed seems in character with other Medick Estates homes, and would be appropriate. Retention of the large Oak tree is essential.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Britton Meyers, representing his employer Nicholson Builders, 5473 Rockwood Rd., and Mr. Eric Maxwell, also with Nicholson Builders, 6961 Hawksbeard Dr., Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Meyers said his client came to him and said he wanted to live in Worthington but the house he purchased needed to be altered. Mr. Coulter asked if the home owner had spoken with any of the neighbors to get feedback and Mr. Meyers said the home owner’s realtor, Erin Labuda, knew the neighborhood well, and has spoken with many of the neighbors. He said once they find out what the Board will or will not approve, they can then go door to door to speak with the neighbors about their plans. Mr. Meyers said the neighborhood

has a traditional feel and many homes have stone. He said they plan to build a traditional style of home. Mr. Meyers showed a fiber cement style of shake they plan to use on the gables. The home owner has also chosen Board and Batten siding for the western wall, the north wall of the master suite, and on part of the enclosed courtyard area. Mr. Meyers also showed the Board members the type of asphalt shingles they plan to use. They plan to use Marvin casement bronze windows for most of the house, and a few windows might be fixed or awning style. The gutters and downspouts will also be bronze to match the windows.

Mrs. Bitar asked what kind of material the cladding was made of and Mr. Meyers said the cladding would be Ultrex which is a fiberglass based material. He said Marvin windows also had an aluminum clad material available. Most of the house will be clad with real stone veneer which is gold and brown, but they still need to determine the color of the grout and paint for the painted areas. Mrs. Bitar asked what materials the lentils will be made of and Mr. Meyers said he would be using real stone material such as limestone. He said they still need to make some decisions regarding the entry door without side light but if the floor plans allow it, they might add a transom over the doorway. They plan to use a fiberglass door for the entryway. Mr. Meyers said the house currently has no insulation in the walls or attic. Mr. Meyers said it was cost prohibitive to try to add electric through the concrete walls. Mr. Sauer asked if the builders are taking the home down to the slab and Mr. Meyers said yes.

Mr. Hofmann said he had picked a nice classical style for the home but he struggled with the front entry gable. Mr. Hofmann because of the position of the stair intermixing with some modern elements the window looks up on its own on the left and looks off center which might be okay but he felt the area needed a little more sensitive thinking and also the canopy above the door looks a bit plunked on. Mr. Hofmann said the turning radius with the detached garage is probably difficult with the way shown and thought that area needed more attention. Mr. Meyers said if the Board would give them a variance to the north and the east they would have more room. He also asked the builders to save the tree. Mr. Meyers said he has already had an arborist check the tree and they would be careful and try to save the tree. Mr. Sauer said he wanted to echo Mr. Hofmann's comments regarding the front of the house, and said his eyes keep going back to the front entry element. Mr. Meyers said that area is still in flux and needs a little more work. Mr. Reis said he would like to see a circular drive for the home but Mr. Meyers said he is only allowed to have one curb cut per street. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, Ohio, said his home is similar to this house, and their houses were built with Claycraft brick. Mr. Mykel said the chimney had some repair work done with a different kind of brick that no longer matches the house. The bricks were no longer made after 1968. Mr. Mykel said he would be hurt to see the house go away and felt having a two-story home built at the entrance to their neighborhood would be a major drastic change. He said part of the charm of Medick Estates is the narrow road. Mr. Mykel said he would like to know how his neighbors felt about the change.

Mr. Meyers requested to table the application. Mr. Hofmann moved to table the application, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye."

E. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.