



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
November 9, 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; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd (arrived at 7:32 p.m.); and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Commission member James Sauer was absent.

\*The audiovisual recording equipment did not work for the majority of this meeting, however there is a recording of the last three items on the agenda.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the October 12, 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**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**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. At the October 12 hearing, the ARB saw a different version of the site plan, showing the reduction to one hotel on the site as well as other site details.

For this hearing, architectural drawings are included for the hotel and the buildings along W. Wilson Bridge Rd.

### **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.
- 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. That count will change with the addition of two-story building on W. Wilson Bridge Rd.
  - 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:
- Buildings #1 & #2 at the easternmost end of the site along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. are proposed as one-story buildings. Building #1 has the look of five storefronts, with a two-story roofline on the west end. A mix of siding and roofing materials and storefront styles is proposed. Building #2 has the look of a two-story roof for the whole building, and also has a mix of siding and roofing materials and storefront styles.
  - Buildings #3 & #4 are proposed as two-story buildings. Building #3 is shown as all brick with a gabled roof over three storefronts and a hipped roof over two storefronts. Building #4 would have a mix of brick and siding and different gabled roofs with the potential for four tenant spaces on the first floor. Differently detailed storefronts are proposed.
  - Building #5 is a four-story hotel with a lower level on the north side at the west end. The building is proposed with gabled roofs that are clipped at the top, and finished with asphalt shingles and standing seam metal. Equipment would presumably be located and screened on the roof. Chimneys are proposed at both ends. Divided light windows with brick soldier courses are proposed and traditional storefront glass would be on the north side by the main entrance.
  - Details of materials and colors would be needed
  - Building #6 is shown as a one-story building along N. High St. Elevations of that building have not been provided.
4. Lighting and signage plans and a detailed landscaping plan are still needed.
5. 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.
6. 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. The architectural renderings show design that was traditionally found in Worthington. The scale and massing, mix of roof shapes, fenestration, and mix of materials are appropriate base on the Design Guidelines. The buildings along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. could accommodate a variety of users.

Staff recommended tabling this application after discussion.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Jack Reynolds, Attorney for Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio, said he was representing his client and they were asking for feedback on the basic design. Along with Mr. Reynolds were Rob MacInnes from Ford & Associates, 1500 W. First Avenue, Columbus, Ohio; Ohm Patel, representing the Witness Group, 600 Enterprise Dr., Lewis Center, Ohio; and Chris Quick of Mannick Smith Group, 1160 Dublin Road, Suite 100, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. MacInnes said they would be using all traditional materials, respecting all four sides of the five buildings. Each building would have their own individuality, but respect the design guidelines. The dumpster enclosure would have the same material. In building one there would be a pedestrian pathway along W. Wilson Bridge Rd., a single floor plan and there could be from one to five tenants. Mr. MacInnes discussed the building elevations and materials. He said the hotel would have a pool, fitness center and storage for utilities. Mr. Foust asked if there would be any parking concerns if one of the buildings became a two-story, and Mr. Reynolds replied no, because there would be only one hotel now, and they are allowed one parking space per room. Mr. Patel said restaurant candidates did not want to have two story tenants above them. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Daniel Birmingham, 6887 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, asked if there were originally 450 spaces required, but only had 380 spots available, how would that affect the overall parking. Mr. Coulter responded they would have to wait to see the results of the traffic study. Mr. Quick said

418 spaces are required. There would be a mix of professional services and restaurants. The office tenants would only be using parking spaces during the day so there would be more parking for the restaurants at night. Mr. Patel said most of hotel parking checks out at 9:00 a.m. after breakfast, then increases after 5:00 p.m. There would be a mix of restaurants that serve lunch and dinner. Mr. Birmingham said he was concerned about spillover in their neighborhood. Mrs. Bitar explained the amount of parking spaces is already high with the comparison to the mix of uses. She said parking could possibly be leased from the office complex to the south if necessary. Mr. Patel said there would be a minimal amount of meeting space, possibly for fifty people. This would not be a convention type of hotel.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, asked if there was a process and if variances would be needed and Mrs. Bitar replied, yes, the applicant would have to ask for variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).

Mr. Andrew Smith, 130 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, said he was concerned about the entrance which was close to his property, and asked if the drive could be moved further to the east. He also asked if there would be screening requirements. Mrs. Bitar explained there would be screening requirements. Mr. Smith asked if any utilities would be moved and Mr. Quick said only the traffic signal would be moving, not the transformers. Mr. Smith asked why the city needed more office space and Mr. Brown explained the City needed income tax revenue in order to survive.

Ms. Kari Hill, 235 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, said she was concerned about the design because she had never seen buildings of this size with two points of ingress/egress. She asked why they did not keep a similar traffic flow. She was also concerned about water retention and storm water flooding. Mrs. Bitar reiterated no one had seen the results of the storm water analysis yet. Mr. Patel said he took very good notes regarding the concerns of the neighbors. He said he would be coming back to address their concerns. Mr. Patel requested to table the application.

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

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

**This application was tabled at the last meeting with a request for modifications to the front elevation.**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

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 hipped roof dormers are now proposed on the front of the main gable instead of the previously proposed shed dormers. The front porch has been widened with a hipped standing seam metal roof supported by three columns, rather than the previous flat roof with brackets.
  - 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.
  - Casement style windows are proposed. The window structure would be black and have stone lintels and sills. A catalogue cut was submitted.
  - Coach lights are proposed.
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 approval of this application. 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. Britain Meyers, 5473 Rockwood Road, Columbus, Ohio and Mr. Erik Maxwell, 6961 Hawksbeard Dr., Westerville, Ohio, said they would be adding a window to the east facing side of the house, Hardi paneling and the bottom may possibly be wood. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Ian Mykel, 325 Medick Way, Worthington, said the look would fit better into the neighborhood but he hoped tearing down houses would not be a growing trend.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY NICHOLSON BUILDERS INC. ON BEHALF OF JANICE GASSER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE AND ADD**

**ONTO THE HOUSE AT 158 MEDICK WAY AS PER CASE NO. AR 82-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 82-17, DATED OCTOBER 31, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

**3. Addition, Garage & Fence – 565 Hartford St. (Peter Lenz AIA/Sheldon) AR 84-17**

**This application was tabled at the last meeting with a request for more information.**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This 1,784 sq. ft. bungalow was built in 1920 in Old Worthington. The house is a contributing structure in the Worthington Historic District. The lot is approximately 0.20-acres and 54± feet in width. The rear of the parcel abuts the Methodist Church Parking Lot. This is a request to demolish the existing rear deck on the house and construct a new family room/garden room addition, covered porch and new deck on the southwest corner of the home. The applicant would also like add a new detached 2-car garage with an attached storage shed. There is also a request to install a new 6-foot solid wood fence along the rear of the property. Fencing along the north property line is no longer requested.

**Project Details:**

**1. Site Plan:**

- The proposed room addition would be constructed to the rear and south side of the existing home. The proposed addition would meet all setback requirements in the R-10 District. The proposed addition and rear deck will be approximately 10-feet from the southern property line.
- The existing home does not have an existing garage on the site. There is an existing storage shed towards the southwest corner of the lot. The site plan shows this storage shed to be removed. The proposed new 462± sq. ft. garage and an approximately 90± sq. ft. attached shed will be 3-feet from the western and northern property line. The applicant was granted variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals to deviate from the required setbacks for accessory structures of 10-foot rear yard and 8-foot side yard requirement. The proposed garage location would allow for enough room to install a turnaround for cars. This would allow the property owners to safely exit the site, thus alleviating the need to back out the driveway.
- There is currently a shared driveway as you enter the site from Hartford St., the applicant is proposing a new driveway that will be separated from the neighbor's

driveway to the north, likely with a row of pavers and landscaping. Details would be presented in the future. The new drive is to be approximately 9-feet in width and the drive approach would be widened.

- There is an existing 4-foot high wood picket fence along the rear of the property that would be replaced with a new 6' solid board fence with the boards overlapping. A gate would be included. The property is adjacent to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot. The Board has approved similar 6-foot tall wood fences adjacent to commercial parking lots.

## 2. Building Addition & Garage:

- Proposed is a one-story family room/garden room addition with a hipped roof. The applicant is proposing a gray standing seam metal roof. Hardie fiber cement siding and trim is proposed for the addition. A ceiling fan with lights would be installed under the covered porch.
- New windows and doors would be Anderson "Woodright" vinyl clad wood. On the south side solid wood panels are proposed to be framed like windows, with transom windows above. On the front elevation, a solid panel is proposed in place of one of the double-hung windows. The trim and panels are proposed to be painted off white.
- A gas fireplace vent is shown on the south side of the house.
- The proposed deck would be constructed of pressure treated lumber.
- The proposed 2-car garage and storage shed will be constructed of yellow pine drop siding, or something similar, painted to match the house. Asphalt shingles are proposed to be used for the garage roof. A garage door with vertical panels is proposed with windows across the top. A square fixed glass window has been added in the gable. The attached shed on the south side would have two openings: a double door and one single door. A single light is proposed above the garage door.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

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:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed addition, garage and fencing are appropriate for this property.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Peter Lenz, 515 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he was representing his clients, Ian and Shelly Sheldon of 565 Hartford, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Lenz said they listened to the Board members at the previous ARB meeting and made some changes accordingly. After discussing the changes that were made, Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Kevin Guthrie, 573 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he had some concerns about the design, and privacy of their backyard because the height of the deck would be 39” off the ground and people would be able to peer over the deck looking into his backyard. Mr. Coulter explained to Mr. Guthrie that he did not own the view, and there are no regulations about privacy.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY PETER LENZ ON BEHALF OF IAN & SALLY SHELDON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR AN ADDITION, GARAGE AND FENCE AT 565 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 84-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 84-17, DATED NOVEMBER 2, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

#### 4. Additions & Garage – **232 E. Granville Rd.** (Story Built Homes) **AR 86-17**

**At the last meeting, the ARB asked for revised elevations for the house that were proportionally correct and showed a consistent style.**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

This single-story 860 sq. ft. home sits on a property that is 50-feet wide and 260-feet deep, and is part of the Griswold Heirs Subdivision that was originally platted in 1896. There is an existing unimproved 20-foot alleyway that runs parallel to E. Granville Rd. between Morning St. and Pingree Dr., however the property owner has direct access to E. Granville Rd. No access has been proposed to the unimproved alleyway. The applicants are requesting approval to add a second story to the main house, add a 520 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the home taking the total square footage of the house to approximately 2,320 sq. ft. The applicant would also like to construct a new 480 sq. ft. 2-car garage on the site. Relocation of an existing 80 sq. ft. shed is also requested as part of this application.

##### **Project Details:**

###### 1. Site Details:

- The plan is to add a second story to house above the existing walls. A survey has been submitted that shows the existing house is 40.1-feet from the front property line, at least 6.8-feet from the eastern property line, and 7.4-feet from the western property line. A variance was approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals for the second story addition to be located in the required front yard of E. Granville Rd. Because the sides of the house are at least 6' from the property line, no side yard variances are required.
- The applicants have also proposed a 5-foot by 12-foot front porch addition to the home. The proposed front porch addition was also approved for a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals to deviate from the required 50-foot front setback along E. Granville Rd. Typically front setbacks are 30-feet, however since this property abuts E. Granville Rd., it is required to be 50-feet.
- A rear 20-foot x 26-foot one-story addition is proposed at the northeast corner of the house with a 16-foot x 8-foot deep deck behind.
- A new sidewalk is proposed that would connect the new front porch to the existing sidewalk along E. Granville Rd. This is consistent with other homes throughout the corridor.
- The property has an existing 3-foot access easement on the neighboring property to the west for the existing driveway. This easement was recorded October 2, 1990 and is a perpetual easement. The applicants have proposed to construct a new concrete driveway with a turnaround to the proposed 2-car detached garage. The existing driveway is asphalt along the entrance with a gravel parking pad behind the existing

- house. The proposed turnaround would allow the property owners to safely exit the site, thus alleviating the need to back out the driveway onto a heavily traveled roadway.
- The applicants have proposed installation of a raingarden in the area adjacent to the new driveway and detached garage to alleviate any additional runoff. Landscaping plans have been submitted showing existing trees to be retained and new shrubs to be planted.
  - The existing 80 sq. ft. storage is proposed to be moved to the north and west corner of the property at 5-feet from the side and rear property lines.
  - An existing condensing unit is located on the east side of the house at the north end. A second unit is proposed adjacent to the existing, so would be east of the addition. These units would be required to be screened on all sides.
  - The City's arborist inspected the trees on the site and feels no harm would be done to them with placement of the new garage.

## 2. Additions & Garage:

- The existing house is of simple form, with a main gable running east and west. The same basic roof form would carry to the second floor, except for a small gabled dormer proposed.
- The proposed 5-foot x 12-foot covered front porch front would have a shed roof supported by round columns. The porch will be constructed of wood decking materials. The porch roof will be standing seam metal painted the color of Burnished Slate. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with their application.
- The applicants have proposed to install all new exterior siding (smart siding with a natural wood grain with a 7-inch reveal on the lap siding and board & batten siding would have a wood finish). The entire home and garage will be painted a Benjamin Moore color (Sea Pearl-White) with light gray wood shutters. The existing home currently has aluminum siding. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with the application.
- Timberline HD Pewter (Gray) lifetime architectural dimensional shingles have been proposed for the house and garage. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with the application.
- JELD-WEN Best Series 36" x 54" white vinyl single hung windows are proposed for the front windows. The front windows appear to have interior muttons/grids only on the upper portion of the window. JELD-WEN Better Series 24" x 36" white vinyl single hung windows are proposed for the side and rear windows, these windows will not have the interior muttons/grids. The existing windows are vinyl, however there is no record of the Board approving window replacement at this address. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with the application.
- The existing glass block basement windows would remain.
- The kitchen sliding door will be JELD-WEN Builders Series 72" x 80" white vinyl sliding patio door. The rear access door will be steel with a window and a solid steel door for the entry to the garage. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with their application.

- The applicant will be utilizing the existing metal front door.
- Exterior lighting has been proposed as part of this project. The applicants are proposing a single-mounted overhead light for the front porch, a light mounted to each side of the rear patio door and a single light proposed over the detached garage door. Please see the Style Guide that was submitted with their application.
- The rear deck will be constructed of pressure treated lumber, and will not have a deck rail. A deck rail is not required since the deck is less than 36” above grade.
- The proposed 2-car garage will complement the materials proposed for the main house. They will be using board & batten siding that will be the same color as the house. They will be using a white Wayne Dalton 16’ garage door and a solid single steel entry door for the garage. A window was added to the east side of the garage.
- There have been several second story additions in Old Worthington over the past decade.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

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:**

Staff recommended approval of the application. The proposed addition of a second story would alter the character of the house, but the proposal would represent a significant investment in the property.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Scott Thompson, 6560 Worthington-Galena Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said he was representing Story Built Homes, and his clients at 232 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Thompson said they changed the window in the front and the back. He also talked with the neighbor about keeping the shed. Mr. Coulter said to make sure there are no side yard or setback issues. Mrs. Lloyd asked about the front porch and Mr. Thompson said they wanted to have the biggest porch they could have for aesthetic purposes. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the columns on the porch could be moved slightly so they would not block the view out of the windows. Mr. Hofmann agreed with Mrs. Lloyd and said that was a good recommendation. Mr. Thompson said he could move the columns over. Mr. Hofmann asked why there was a lack of windows on the first floor and Mr. Thompson said they needed a wall for the television. Mr. Thompson distributed materials to the Board members for review. Mr. Foust asked why the windows were not consistent all the way around the house and Mr. Thompson said he could add muntins on the other windows. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY STORY BUILT HOMES ON BEHALF FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND GARAGE AT 232 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 86-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 86-17, DATED OCTOBER 31, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:**

- **THAT THE SIDES OF THE FRONT PORCH ROOF BE FILLED IN AND A CEILING BE CONSTRUCTED;**
- **THE PORCH COLUMNS ARE TO BE MOVED TO THE CORNERS;**
- **ADD WINDOWS TO THE RIGHT SIDE; AND**
- **ADD MUNTINS TO ALL THE WINDOWS.**

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

5. Parking Lot Expansion – **41 W. New England Ave.** (Kevin Rohyans) **AR 88-17**  
**Request for Reconsideration**

**The applicant was denied approval at the last meeting by a 3-3 vote, and the applicant is asking the application be reconsidered. The applicant is requesting approval to add parking spaces to the lot east of the Snow House and in front of the carriage house. Directional signage is now included as part of the request.**

Mr. Reis moved to reconsider the application, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, “Aye.”

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

The Snow House was built in 1814 by John Snow, who was an influential leader of the Masonic Lodge and held early lodge meetings at the house. The Federal style brick house features a symmetrical five-bay façade, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. An addition was later constructed to the rear. The Snow House was used as a residence until approximately 1930; was an annex to the Worthington Inn; and housed an expansion of Igloo Letter Press. The commercial structure was constructed around 1920, likely as a garage/carriage house/utility shed, and was converted for commercial use. Most recently, the Candle Lab and Igloo Letter Press were located in the building. There is also a shed on the site in the southwest corner.

In 2014, the owners were approved to demolish the commercial structure and shed on the property, and construct 5 new dwelling units on the site. The Snow house was to remain unchanged and be used as a single dwelling unit, except the metal stair to the rear was to be removed. In 2016, the applicant made modifications to the Snow House and adjacent landscaping, but has not proceeded with demolition to the carriage house, which is now being used as office space.

**Project Details:**

1. Six additional spaces are proposed for a total of 12 parking spots in front of the carriage house. The lot would remain gravel, with cement parking blocks lining the east and west edges.
2. The request includes four 12” wide x 18” high directional signs: 2 on the east side near the carriage house for Datafield Technology Services; and 2 on the west side near the sidewalk for Balance Beauty spa. Two existing towing signs are proposed for reuse. The applicant would like the signs to be installed at 48” above grade which would require a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.
3. Board of Zoning Appeals approval would also be needed for this modification to parking in the C-5 Zoning District.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Close spacing of buildings and lack of land in Worthington’s commercial district mean that new parking lots cannot easily be created. Screen parking with landscaping such as low bushes, especially if site conditions require that you put parking near the front of the building. Encourage sharing of parking spaces between businesses and land parcels.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as additional parking is needed and the change would be minor. Landscape screening of the parking should be considered.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Rohyans, 634 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter felt the 48” height for the towing signs was a good compromise. He asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Ms. Jeanne Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she frequents the area and is in favor of the height.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY KEVIN ROHYANS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CREATE ADDITIONAL PARKING AT 41 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 89-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 89-17, DATED OCTOBER 13, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, abstained. The motion was approved.

**C. Architectural Review Board - New**

1. Additions & Renovation – **93 W. Granville Rd.** (Heidi Bolyard/Welch) **AR 91-17**

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This two-story Colonial Revival house was constructed in the late 1800’s and renovated in 1920. The 2961 square foot house is on a rare ¾ acre parcel in Old Worthington and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The detached garage is also a contributing building.

The owners would like to construction additions on the front and rear of the house and make modifications to the existing house.

**Project Details:**

1. The applicant is proposed some changes to the existing house, including the addition of stone veneer on the foundation and shutters for the windows on the front of the house. The front stoop would be wrapped with the same stone as proposed for the house and the floor and steps would have 8” x 4” pavers (Mission Split Tumbled Clay Brown). Existing cedar shakes on the second story of the house that are damaged would be replaced with new cedar shakes. The entire house is proposed to be painted with Sherwin Williams Extra White #SW 7006, and the new shutters would be black. The roof is not proposed to be replaced.
2. The proposed 79.4 square foot front addition would fill in an area between the house and attached garage, with the wall lining up with the garage wall which is set back about 14’ from the front of the house. This addition would allow for construction of a full bath and mudroom. An existing window on the side of the house would be removed and the roof gable is proposed to match the garage roof. That face of the garage roof would be replaced so the new shingles would match exactly. The new wall would be sided with cedar shakes to match the house, have stone veneer on the foundation, and a double hung clad wood window is proposed with trim and shutters to match the existing windows in the house.
3. To the rear, removal of a sunroom and covered porch structure would allow for construction of a 302.2 square foot one and one-half story addition to include a kitchen on the first floor and a master bath above. The addition would have a gable to the rear and shallow pitched dormers. The proposed siding is Hardie board and batten for the first floor and cedar shakes on the second floor. Windows would be double hung clad wood with trim to match the existing. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof.
4. New doors from the kitchen and family room are proposed to empty onto a roughly 12’ x 6’ landing with steps down to a patio that would be about 14’ x 11’. Final patio design and landscaping would likely return to the ARB at a later date. An additional door with a landing and steps to the back yard is proposed in place of a window in the connector between the house and garage. All doors would be clad wood with matching trim, and the landings, steps and patio would be 8” x 4” pavers (Mission Split Tumbled Clay Brown).
5. A brick retaining wall constructed with the same pavers is proposed at the front property line. The wall would be 3’ in height and ~39’ wide to match the width of the main house.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

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:**

Staff recommended approval of the application. The proposed modifications and additions are compatible with the existing structure and appropriate for the District.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Heidi Bolyard, 75 S. Front St., Dublin, Ohio, said she was representing her clients Matt and Leslie Welch, of 93 W. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust asked if the sidewalk would be stone or concrete and Mr. Welch said they would prefer tumbled pavers. Mr. Hofmann said he thought the changes were nice and Mrs. Holcombe felt the changes were a major improvement. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY HEIDI BOLYARD ON BEHALF OF LESLIE & MATT WELCH FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE AND ADD ONTO THE EXISTING HOUSE AT 93 W. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 91-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 91-17, DATED OCTOBER 26, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Sculpture Garden – **820 High St.** (CYP Studios/Worthington Public Library) **AR 93-17**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

The Worthington Public Library purchased the site at the southwest corner of E. Stafford Ave. and Hartford St. in 1973, and received approval to construct a new library in 1977 & 78. The library moved from 752 High St. to 805 Hartford St. in 1979. In 1993, the library purchased the office building adjacent to the west at 820 High St. That site was home to a gas station starting in the 1930's, with the current building being constructed in 1977 as a First Federal Savings and Loan. In 1996, the buildings were combined and renovated for use by the Worthington Libraries. Additional modifications were made in 2007.

The Friends Foundation of Worthington Libraries commissioned a sculpture earlier this year and now are requesting approval of a garden to display the sculpture.

**Project Details:**

1. The sculpture features woodland characters Ricky (raccoon), Asparagus (fox), and Winston (owl) from the summer reading club. The sculptor, Mike Tizzano, has been working on the piece in the library lobby, and is expected to send the sculpture to a foundry in Baltimore, MD this month. The plan is to display the sculpture in a garden area comprised of landscaping, hardscaping and lighting in the area west of the library along N. High St.
2. The general outside layout of the sculpture garden would be rectangular, with two large circles to simulate an owl's eyes inside. New concrete sidewalk is proposed on the north side and a brick path would wind through the space between the circles. The sculpture would be in the northern circle, and both circle areas would have decomposed granite for a base and curved concrete benches with wood tops for seating. Stepping stones are proposed around the edges of the circles.
3. A large variety of plants are proposed in the area, including steppable perennials and grasses. Native and adaptable plants are proposed. Names and photographs of the plants are included in the packet. None of the plants appear to be evergreen.
4. The existing street trees in the tree lawn area would remain.
5. Up-lighting is proposed for the trees along the building and at the south end of the garden. Lighting would be included under the edges of the benches to illuminate the ground. Also,

a spot light is proposed to light the sculpture. The average light level proposed for the site would be less than a footcandle. Specifications are included in the packet for inground and tapelight lighting, but the proposed locations are not clear.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important. Landscaping works with other site elements such as paving and street furniture to create the district's sense of high quality.

A small amount of landscaping can have a positive impact; this is already easy to see in the many well-landscaped spots in Worthington's commercial district. Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate for the relatively small spaces here and provide relief from the "hardscape" of buildings, streets, and other man-made elements. Plant materials should be selected for appropriate size, shape, color, and "pedestrian friendliness" (avoid, for example, thorny species that can catch dresses or scratch children). Pots or planters permit moving plants and flowers around for best effect.

Have a regular maintenance program for landscaping. Small details such as weed-filled planters or accumulated litter can give a strong negative impression. Do not plant any more than can be maintained easily.

### **Recommendations:**

- The natural looking garden area proposed is not typical for High St. North of Granville Rd. the buildings are set back from the street, with street trees, grass and shrubs planted being the primary treatment between the buildings and sidewalk. At North St. and south of Granville Rd., walls and formal planting areas are in place.
- The plant material may look dead in the winter which could exacerbate the different look of the proposed garden.
- The north side of the library may be a better location for the proposed sculpture garden.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter said he was recusing himself from the discussion and would turn the meeting over to the Vice-Chair, Mr. Reis. Mr. Reis asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jeanne Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Martin said there are two trees in bad condition that will be removed, but they will be replacing them with seven trees to help create a physical barrier to the area. Currently there are no sidewalks to the area, so they will be adding sidewalks and concrete benches to keep people safe. Lights will be added to upright the new trees with warm LED lighting. They will landscape the area with a continually blooming species of plants in the garden for spring, summer and fall, including the planting of blueberries. Mr. Reis asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mrs. Suzanne Seals, 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, felt this area was a great location and would not want to see the park area moved to the west. She was in favor of the project.

Mr. John Butterfield, 678 Thorne St., Worthington, Ohio, explained he is a library Board member and he is in favor of this project. Mr. Tizzano, the Sculptor, said children would be able to take their pictures on the bench sculptures. Mrs. Holcombe felt the garden was appropriate and charming. Mr. Reis said the plan was well thought out and a nice addition to the area.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SCULPTURE GARDEN AT 820 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 93-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 93-17, DATED OCTOBER 26, 2017, BE APPROVED 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, abstained, Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

**D. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Conditional Use Permit**

- a. Vocational Instruction/Ancillary Service – **6300 Proprietors Rd., Suite B** (Deborah Hitt/Reflexology Certification Institute) **CU 16-17**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This parcel is on the east side of Proprietor’s Rd., adjacent to the railroad, and has 3 buildings that were built in the 1980’s. In the front there is a two-story office building; to the south is a one-story office building; and to the rear is a larger one-story building which houses Sullivan Builders and Ohio Beer Co.

This applicant would like approval to operate a Vocational Instruction business in Suite B of the two-story building, which is a Conditional Use in the I-1 Zoning District.

**Project Details:**

The business is called Reflexology Certification Institute, and is an educational facility offering reflexology training. Ancillary to that business would be the ability for the Executive Director to offer reflexology services to clients that are not part of the training program. The space designated to accommodate ancillary services is limited to 9.92% of the floor area, and would also be used for instructional purposes.

**Basic Standards and Review Elements:** The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern –The typical number of daily visitors would be 1-4, and the applicant sites the existing parking would be sufficient.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would not change.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Monday through Friday, 9:00 am – 7:30 pm and limited weekend hours on an exception basis.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No change is proposed for the exterior of the building or the site.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No change is proposed for the exterior of the building or the site.

**Land Use Plans:**Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Vocation Instruction definition:

“Vocational instruction” means the professional training/instruction on site of persons in small groups, typically less than 100 total, usually related to the proper operation of equipment, including business, commercial, industrial, and/or communications technology equipment and computers.

Ancillary Retail definition:

"Ancillary retail/service" means a retail or service facility that is clearly incidental and subordinate to the primary use of a structure. Such retail or service facility shall not occupy more than ten percent (10%) of the gross floor area of the structure where located.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed. In any case it is critical that the City protect the industrial corridor as an employment center.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed business would meet the basic standards for conditional uses.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Deborah Hitt, 6300 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio gave an explanation of what reflexology is about. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DEBORAH HITT OF REFLEXOLOGY CERTIFICATION INSTITUTE FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION & ANCILLARY SERVICES IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6300 PROPRIETORS RD., SUITE B, AS PER CASE NO. CU 16-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 16-17, DATED OCTOBER 11, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

Five minute break at 9:45 p.m.

**2. Planned Unit Development - Unfinished**

- a. Preliminary Plan – Alzheimer’s/Dementia/Memory Care Facility – **800 Proprietors Rd.**  
(The Griffin 105 Group, LLC) **PUD 01-17**

**New information is in the packet but has not been reviewed by staff. See previous comments below.**

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

Worthington Foods was a manufacturing facility that occupied 8.75 acres at the northeast corner of Proprietors and E. Granville Roads. The property was sold in 2005 and the plant and most other buildings were demolished to allow for redevelopment of the site into 88,000 square feet of office condominiums. The northern building, which was a retail store that sold the Morningstar Farms products manufactured at the facility, was split from the larger parcel and has housed several businesses since that time. The southern 7.75 acres began to develop in 2005 with four office condominiums being constructed over the following four years, covering roughly 3 acres. For various reasons, a small piece of land on the north side and the southern ~4.75 acres were never developed. Different developers have proposed various uses over the years, including storage facilities and residential. With the former manufacturing facility and the previously proposed office, income tax generation was a significant consideration on the site. The other proposed uses did not offer that same amenity.

This is an application for a use that would also fall short of the original income tax goal, but would have some employees. The plan is to construct a memory care facility on the southern 4.84 acres. Thirty-five full time employees and 5 part time employees are planned for the first year, and that number may increase in future years.

### ***Project Details:***

The Preliminary Plan submittal should include the following:

- (1) A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300 feet of the area proposed for the PUD;

A legal description of the 4.841 acre piece of land is included with the packet. A subdivision is needed to align the parcel lines with the proposed and existing developments. The property is adjacent to railroad right-of-way to the east; office condos to the north; and multifamily residential to the west.

- (2) Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan;

The Griffin 105 Group LLC is the owner and is represented by David Hodge, attorney with Underhill & Hodge LLC. Advanced Civil Design is the engineer; Faris Planning and Design is working on the site design and landscaping; and the architect is Collaborative Design, Ltd.

- (3) Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site;
- (4) A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land

included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). In lands contiguous to or adjacent to the flood plain of the Olentangy River, existing contours shall be shown in accordance with the elevations set forth in Chapter;

- (5) Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300 feet of the area proposed for PUD;
- (6) Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations;

This information is included on the drawings.

- (7) The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community;
- (8) A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger;

Many existing trees and vegetation on the site would be removed, except the 200+ year old 72" Oak tree near the Proprietors Rd. right-of-way would be preserved and maintained. Protection would be needed for the tree during construction, and a future plan for maintenance is needed. Placement of any structures, including sidewalk, under the tree canopy should be avoided.

Other trees are either in poor condition or growing into power lines and may be replaced. The vegetation at the south end of the property in the right-of-way should be replaced.

- (9) A preliminary grading plan;

The existing and proposed grades for the site are relatively flat.

- (10) Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City;

Four buildings are proposed for the site, with connection by breezeway or in one case an activity room. Each of the residential buildings are proposed with interior courtyards. Preliminary sketches show an architectural character that may be compatible with the office condominiums to the north (depot style) and Worthington architecture generally. Brick and eco-friendly ultra-premium vinyl are the main materials proposed for the buildings.

Parking would be on the north and east sides of the building, with a drive connecting from Proprietor's Rd. to the railway property to the east through an access easement. The curb cut and turning radii are proposed large enough to allow trucks to pass through the site. The total number of parking spaces versus the Code requirement and the actual need is not known. Bicycle parking is shown. Trees are proposed throughout the parking area as is required by the Code.

Sidewalks are proposed adjacent to the parking areas, between the parking and buildings, and in the Proprietors Rd. right-of-way. Two areas would have curved walkways connecting the public sidewalk to the buildings. Although the area to the south is shown with a fence, having it open may allow consideration as a Public Space Amenity. Other Public Space Amenities may be needed. Additional consideration is needed for the sidewalk area to the north to ensure protection of the oak tree.

Tract coverage by buildings is stated as 23.5% in the development text.

Landscape plans with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and perennials are included for the areas around the buildings, and in the main entry to the office which would accommodate some of the visitors to the site. The entrance would have a circular drive off of Proprietors Rd. near the north end of the site, and included a curved masonry wall used for a sign. Directional signs would also be used at the other entrance and around the site.

A screen wall was installed along the rear property line when Worthington Station was planned. The existing wall would remain and the addition of a gate across the opening for the access easement is likely.

- (11) The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities;

Existing and proposed utilities have been identified and reviewed by the City Engineer.

- (12) Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications;

No land would be dedicated.

- (13) Proposed Easements;

Proposed is relocation of the access easement to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. property adjacent to the east, currently used by Silcott Railway Equipment Ltd. The business provides services to the railroad industry. An existing easement that runs east

to west at the entrance to Silcott would be moved so the entrance is at the north end, and then heads south near the east property line.

Existing easements for the screen wall and utilities would stay in place, and new utility easements may be needed.

- (14) Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre;

The applicant is proposing 54 private and semi-private rooms which average 399 square feet per resident, or approximately 11 units/acre.

- (15) Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use;

The only use would be a memory care facility.

- (16) Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase;

Information is needed.

- (17) Homeowners or commercial owners' association materials;

Information not needed.

- (18) Development Standards Text; and

Included in packet.

- (19) Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed. In any case it is critical that the City protect the industrial corridor as an employment center.

Code Section 1174.05 Development Standards and Development Standards Text

Development Standards Text shall be a comprehensive narrative detailing the Development Standards for the proposed development, including without limitation the following:

- (a) Design Regulations:

(1) Character. The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.

(2) Design. Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.

(3) Screening. Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.

(4) Tract Coverage. The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.

(b) Traffic and Parking:

(1) Traffic. Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD. The proposed PUD shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Where potential congestion may be alleviated by installation of Improvements on streets abutting the development, the developer shall be required to pay the cost of the construction of Improvements and shall dedicate or deed lands necessary for street widening purposes when so required by the City. A traffic study shall be provided by the applicant as required by the City.

(2) Parking. Parking shall adhere to the following standards:

A. Design. Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.

B. Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) percent of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.

C. Residential Uses. There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.

D. Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.

(c) General Requirements:

(1) Environment. The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.

(2) Natural Features.

A. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.

B. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part

of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.

(3) Public Area Payments.

A. The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.

B. Whenever commercial or industrial space is created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per 1000 gross square feet of new or expanded commercial or industrial space for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.

C. Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.

D. The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.

(4) Public Space Amenities. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

A. An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet;

B. Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width;

C. Public art;

D. Decorative planters;

E. Bicycle racks;

F. Permanent fountains or other Water Features;

G. Decorative waste receptacles;

H. Decorative pedestrian lighting; and

I. Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

City Code Section 1174.08 PUD Procedures:

(a) Pre-application. The applicant may request review and feedback from City staff and/or the Municipal Planning Commission prior to preparing a Preliminary Plan. No discussions, opinions, or suggestions provided shall bind the applicant, or the City, or be relied upon by the applicant to indicate subsequent approval or disapproval by the City.

(b) Preliminary Plan.

(1) Municipal Planning Commission. The Municipal Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council that the application for PUD be approved as requested, approved with modifications, or disapproved. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission disapproves the application, the petitioner may elect not to have the same recommended to the City Council.

(2) City Council. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the Municipal Planning Commission, the requested PUD shall be set forth in Ordinance form and shall thereafter be introduced in writing at a meeting of the City Council, and the City Council shall fix a date for a public hearing. Such hearing may be held on but not before the fourteenth day following the fixing of the date or on any day thereafter. Notice of the public hearing shall be given by announcement of the day, hour, place and subject, one time, in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, and the hearing date and time shall be posted on the property to be considered for the PUD. During the period between the fixing of the date of the hearing and the date of the hearing, the Preliminary Plan, shall be kept on file in the office of the Planning and Building Department for public examination during regular office hours. The availability of such materials shall be indicated in the published notice of the hearing.

After receiving from the Municipal Planning Commission the recommendations for the proposed PUD and after holding the above public hearing, the City Council shall consider such recommendations and vote on the passage of the proposed PUD Ordinance. The City Council may, by a majority of all its members, adopt or reject the proposed Ordinance, with or without change.

(c) Final Plans.

(1) The Municipal Planning Commission shall review Final Plans for compliance with the approved PUD Ordinance and shall:

A. Approve the Final Plan as requested;

B. Approve the Final Plan with modifications as agreed by the applicant which do not change the essential character of the approved PUD and do not need review by the City Council;

C. Recommend the Final Plan to the City Council with changes that require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance; or

D. Disapprove the proposed Final Plan when said plan does not meet the requirements of the PUD.

**Recommendations:**

## Use Considerations:

When the Development Plan was approved for this site, it was anticipated the proposed Worthington Station office condominiums would house businesses which would generate significant income tax for the City. Although this proposal is an attractive plan aesthetically and a needed use in central Ohio, the proposed use would produce just a fraction of the amount of income tax originally expected. The southern part of the property has been vacant since 2005, but has not generated a problem for the City.

## Design Considerations:

- The proposed plan for the site with the building, driveway and parking layout and the proposed landscaping is designed to fit with the surrounding properties without adversely impacting the area. The entrances to the site are shown away from the intersection with E. Granville Rd. and site design appears to allow needed access to the railway while providing adequate parking for the facility. The site layout seems appropriate with buildings toward the street and parking to the rear.
- The general architectural style may be appropriate for this site. Additional detail could be required with this application, or would be expected with Final Plan and Architectural Review Board applications. As vinyl siding is not typically desired in the Architectural Review District, a sample should be provided and its use should be discussed and specifically made part of or left out of the Development Standards. Other materials should also be discussed.
- General landscaping and lighting seem compatible with the Architectural Review District.
- Location and screening of refuse containers may need refinement.
- Parking must be evaluated, included bicycle parking.
- No environmental issues have been identified by the applicant, but should be addressed if present.
- The significant natural feature is the Oak tree. Protection during and after construction is critical. Removal and installation of sidewalks or other permanent structures under the tree canopy should be avoided.
- Review of Public Space Amenities is needed.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Hodge, Attorney, said he was representing his client, Mr. Don Kenney Jr., of 470 Olde Worthington Rd., Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Hodge said the materials would now consist of JamesHardi Board and Batten siding and brick. He said there is presently no walkway available, but they would add a sidewalk, and they have removed the picket fence at the southwest corner in favor of a hedge and plantings. There would be a five foot walk up the entire span of the property that comes up into the property as a public space amenity under the PUD.

Mrs. Bitar said there were discussions with Darren Hurley, the Parks and Recreation Director, who leads the Bike & Pedestrian Committee. The committee may suggest a recreation path that could be made a little bit wider. Mr. Hodge said there was some discussion at the previous

meeting about making an iconic structure which is why they had the idea of adding a clock which would provide an element of interest at the corner of the intersection. They reduced the number of spaces which reduces total impervious surface. Previously they had approximately 116 parking spaces and now they have 84. The northernmost building has been shifted to the east, and they removed a row of parking from the east side of the building to make sure the old Oak tree survives. He said they have engaged Joseph's Tree Service and an Arborist to study the tree's condition and to give them advice as to measures to take in the development process to make sure the tree will survive. The information will be added to their development text to be reviewed by City Staff and City Council.

Mr. Hodge said they have provided the staff and the Commission with additional architectural information and are seeking feedback so approval can be sought in December. The landscaping along the southern perimeter of the site is very tired, and they will be re-doing the entire area and will enclose specific details in the near future.

Mr. Hofmann said he appreciated the idea of the clock tower and felt it was a nice touch. He felt they were following the Design Guidelines pretty well. Mr. Reis agreed and felt the architecture had come a long way. Mr. Coulter asked the developers to discuss the different styles they have used on the buildings and why those styles were chosen.

Mr. Kenney said going through the Design Guidelines, he pinpointed a few of the buildings. They drove around the city and took a look at some of the historic buildings and tried to mimic some, such as the Orange Johnson House. They would like to create a look for their residents so they feel like they are at home, and not in an institution. Mrs. Holcombe said she also felt the clock was appropriate and liked the appearance of the timeless architecture. Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the attention to the details and how it tied back to the historical district. Mr. Reis agreed and said he felt the developers were right on track. Mr. Coulter said he liked the changes and has always been a fan of porches. He liked the detail which was reminiscent of the old train station. Mr. Brown said he would be meeting with Ms. Anne Brown, the City's Public Information Officer about adding a link to the City's webpage about this development. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mr. Reis moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

#### **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 10:15 p.m.