



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
July 26, 2018

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; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building was absent; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Laney Ellzey, Building & Planning Assistant. Board members Amy Lloyd, and Richard Schuster; and Commission member Edwin Hofmann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the July 26, 2018 meeting

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted “Aye,” and the minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board – New

1. Design Modifications – **529 High St.** (Jeanne Lennon/Lennonheads) **AR 53-18** (Amendment to AR 44-17 & AR 06-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 3400 square foot classically detailed commercial structure was constructed in the early 1970’s, and is currently home to Lennonheads Salon & Spa. Approval was granted by the ARB to construct additions on the north and west sides of the building in June of 2017. In January of 2018 the plans were modified with a revised rear addition.

The owner is now asking to amend the previous approval, as construction costs were going to be considerably higher than the architects estimate. More modest changes are now proposed.

Project Details:

1. The front addition is no longer proposed with gables added at both ends and additional enclosed space. Instead the owner would like to construct a gable above the entrance toward the center of the building. A matching gable would be added to the rear, slightly offset from the front, and the rear addition would extend from that gable to the west 25', being 4' deep. The area is needed for circulation inside the salon.
2. As previously approved, the owner would like to install a black standing seam metal roof, and paint the existing brick white. Also, new board and batten siding painted white is proposed for the gables, and would be used for the rear addition.
3. The eastern 2/3 of the existing covered porch would now be re-used, but would have a sloped standing seam metal roof rather than the existing flat roof. Exposed black metal brackets are proposed to help support the new roof, and would extend to the columns. It appears the columns would be, or look like, wood.
4. On the east side, a stained barn door is proposed.
5. In front of the western 1/3 of the building sidewalk would be removed to allow landscaping to be added.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Construction of an addition to a commercial or institutional building should be approached in the same way as one for an existing home. Such a project involves important design considerations, since an addition can have a major impact on neighboring properties. Include the following considerations when planning an addition to a commercial or institutional building.

- Use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial and institutional buildings in Worthington. These most commonly include brick; frame construction is less common.
- The addition should be subordinate to the main building. This does not necessarily mean that the addition must be smaller than the original, but it should be designed in a way that it does not overwhelm and dominate the original.
- Some architectural review boards require that additions be designed so that they are easily distinguished from the original building. While this is acceptable in Worthington, the Architectural Review Board does not require it. Matching the original building's design elements in an addition is acceptable.
- Generally, additions should be located as far as possible to the rear of the original building. There may be some instances, however, where building an addition on the front of the original building may be a preferable option. This would especially be true when an addition could replace a front parking lot.
- Paint only surfaces that have been painted before. Stone surfaces were seldom painted originally; painted brick surfaces tend to be more common on commercial buildings than residential. Poor weather resistance or damage to a wall were the usual reasons for painting brick, though sometimes it was just to change the building's look. While unpainted brick or stone should not be painted, if such a surface has been painted in the past, consider re-

painting rather than removing the old paint. Avoid using too many colors on a building. Consider using light and dark shades of the same color when choosing body and trim colors.

- While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important.

Recommendation:

Staff feels the wood columns and barn door are not appropriate for this building and not typical for commercial buildings in Worthington. White columns may be acceptable.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Matt Lones, 411 Meditation Lane, Columbus, Ohio; and Ms. Jeanne Lennon, 529 High St., Worthington, Ohio, discussed the changes they would like to make to give Lennonheads a fresh look. He felt some of the costs could be reduced by reducing the porch, and improving the interior layout for the stylist would be an improvement. The style of the proposed improvements would be in keeping with the previous approval. Installing the barn door in the location of the existing door. They will be removing the eight foot sidewalk and replacing with a five foot sidewalk which will still be in compliance with ADA requirements. Landscaping will also be added to soften that portion of the building. The dumpster enclosure will stay in the southeast area to match what was previously approved. The projection to the south will still stay in the same area. The wood would add warmth to the existing color pallet and materials.

Mr. Foust said he had some issues with the proposed changes because he felt they were going in the wrong direction. He did not have a problem with the proposed changes to the gables, or the addition to the rear, but he could not envision how this overall look would fit into the neighborhood. He said he understood the building was a gas station in the 1960's and there are budget restraints, but he did not feel the proposed changes would fit the standards for the area. Our standards call for changes to be more compatible with its surroundings, and have a New England Village environment of Worthington feel.

Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the addition of the greenery at the west end of the building but she felt the beams in the front should be painted the same color as the building. Also expressed concerns related to the barn door. The door appears to look like a drive-thru. Mr. Lones said even if they changed the color, the building would still have an agrarian feel.

Mr. Foust said Board and Batten does not have to be an agrarian feel, the material was commonly used as an exterior finish from the 1840's to the 1860's. Mr. Foust said he was struggling with the barn doors facing High Street because that is not the look and feel of the buildings facing High Street. Mr. Reis asked why the cupolas were taken off and Mr. Lones said the previous design did not include them, but they are still on the building. The owner wanted to cut costs, and the building would be of a more agrarian style without the cupolas.

Mr. Reis felt the proposed drawing made the building look like a zebra and he felt more work needed to be done. He asked why the copula was removed. Mr. Lones stated that the previous approval did not show the copula. Mr. Coulter clarified the Board and Batten material would be

changed to white, and he also liked the addition of the greenery. He also agreed with the other Board members opinion regarding the barn doors, and felt the doors were inappropriate for the area right on High Street. Mr. Lones asked Mr. Coulter if they could move forward with project in the back of the building. Mrs. Bitar said it was okay to move forward with the back portion of the building, but a new application would have to be submitted for the front portion of the project. 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 JEANNE LENNON TO AMEND CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 44-17 & AR 06-18 WITH DESIGN MODIFICATIONS AT 529 HIGH ST., AND THAT THE EAST AND NORTH ELEVATIONS BE REVISED AND RESUBMITTED AS PER CASE NO. AR 53-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 53-18, DATED JUNE 14, 2018, 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Rear Patio, Fence, Walkway – **688 Hartford St.** (Marcus W. Hitt) **AR 63-18** (Amendment to AR 95-17)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is a Cape Cod that was built in 1938 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. This property is 43’ wide and extends roughly 252’ to the east. The owners are in the process of constructing a rear addition; replacing the siding and windows; renovating the garage; constructing a shed; replacing existing fencing; and adding brick to the front porch and drive.

This request is for approval to install patio space instead of a deck; modify the fence style; and replacing the front walkway.

Project Details:

1. The owners would like to install a patio to the rear of the addition instead of the previously approved deck. The patio is proposed behind the house and garage, and would have 20” high retaining/seating walls framing the east side. Materials include Armortec 3-piece ledgestone design (sample needed) and limestone quarry blend pavers.
2. Replacement of 40 feet of chain link fence was approved along the south property line near the garage, with the new fence to match the neighbors’ fence to the south. Now the owner would like to install a fence to match the picket fence he installed on the north side of his

property. The proposed fence would have 3 ¾” dog eared pickets with 4” spacing between pickets.

3. In addition to repairing the front porch and steps, and facing them with brick, the owner would now like to replace the walkway to the front porch with matching brick.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, if the Armortec material is suitable for the proposed application.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Marcus Hitt, 688 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hitt reminded the Board members he was at a previous meeting in December of 2017 to seek approval to renovate his entire house which is 80 years old. They originally had proposed a deck, but due to the sloping elevation they will need to install a patio instead. They would also like the property to have matching fencing, cap the front porch with brick and replace the front walkway so everything will match. The brick will back with what will be installed along the driveway. Mr. Hitt explained Armortec will make the brick last longer, however it looks the same. The applicant brought a sample to show the Board, however he did not bring a sample of the brick for the sidewalk. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARCUS W. HITT TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #95-17 BY ADDING A PATIO, MODIFYING FENCING, AND REPLACING THE BRICK WALKWAY AT 688 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-18, DATED JULY 12, 2018 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Front Porch Modifications – **565 Evening St.** (Romano and Juliet Klepec) **AR 64-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This English Cottage style home was constructed in 1939 and has its main entrance through a screened porch on the north side of the house, set back from the front part of the house. The owners would like to remove the screens and install new columns and railings.

Project Details:

1. The existing opening to the porch is not centered on the step and is framed to the soffit. The new railing would be centered on the step, and only columns would extend to the roof structure. The railing is proposed with square newels and balusters.
2. A new 9 ½" soffit is proposed to enclose the headers, which would allow placement of the house address on the front.
3. New materials would be Cedar or pressure treated finished wood.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

From about 1915 on, porches generally were simplified and more integrated into the design of the house. Simple square or tapered columns were common. New porches (located where one is missing or there has not been a porch in the past) should be built in a simple design. Look at original porches on similar buildings -- height, materials, roof slope, and width -- and use these to develop a design. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed porch changes are appropriate for this house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Romano Klepec, 565 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said the porch has termite damage and part of it needs to be replaced. Mr. Foust and Mrs. Holcombe said they both liked what was being proposed. 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 ROMANO AND JULIET KLEPEC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE FRONT PORCH ROOF AT 565 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-18, DATED JULY 12, 2018, 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Rear Porch Addition – **232 E. Granville Rd.** (Suncraft Corporation/Fortman) **AR 65-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is 50-feet wide and 260-feet deep, and is part of the Griswold Heirs Subdivision that was originally platted in 1896. The structure was recently converted from a single-story 860 sq. ft. house to a two-story 2320 square foot house, and a new 480 sq. ft. 2-car garage was constructed on the site.

The new homeowners would like to add a covered porch to the rear of the house.

Project Details:

1. A roughly 29' wide x 13' deep porch is proposed to the rear of the house. The structure is proposed 4" west of the northeast corner of the house so as to be 6' from side property line as is required by Code for additions to houses on existing lots of record.
2. The porch is proposed with a gabled roof over most of the area, and a nested gable over a 13' wide x 4'7" deep extension on the east side. Also proposed on the east side are a fireplace, and steps going down to the yard. Additional steps are shown heading to the rear at the middle of the porch.
3. Materials for the porch would include: cement board with battens to side the gables and chimney; Miratec wrapped columns and headers; white aluminum fascia; and pine vertical skirting. Clarification is needed regarding the roofing, railing and flooring materials. Wood stairs are called out on the plan.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of the application after the following are considered/modified:

- Siding on chimneys is not preferable in the Architectural Review District.
- Additional information is needed regarding the roofing, railing and flooring materials.
- Placement of the west end of the deck in front of a first floor window seems awkward.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. James Knox, representing the Suncraft Corporation, 122 W. Johnstown Rd., Gahanna, Ohio, said he resolved the previous issue of needing a variance by moving the porch over a few inches. Mr. Knox clarified for Mr. Foust

where the fireplace would be located. 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 SUNCRAFT CORPORATION, INC. ON BEHALF OF CRAIG AND KARA FORTMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A COVERED REAR PORCH AT 232 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 65-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 65-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Paint – 753 High St. (Worthington Presbyterian Church/Kingsley Ray House) AR 66-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Historic records indicate the brick structure at 753 High St. was constructed in 1826 for Dr. Kingsley Ray and his wife Mary. A framed structure was added in 1856 on the south side of the house. Around 1870, the building reportedly served as the post office for a time. Other framed additions were built in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to allow the structure to accommodate two residences. The earlier south side addition was mostly removed at the time of that construction.

The Worthington Presbyterian Church purchased the building in 1965 and rented out the property for 25 years after which time the structure was vacant. The church demolished most of the framed additions in the early 1990's to allow for expansion of the church, leaving only the original brick building with the second story framed addition above. In January of 2017, approval was given by the ARB to remove the second story addition and install a new roof on the building.

This is a request to paint the building a different color.

Project Details:

1. Typically the ARB does not review painting a structure, but because the color was specifically talked about by the ARB, and this building is a prominent historic structure on the Village Green, staff felt Board review and an opportunity for public comment were warranted.
2. The building was painted the current blue-green color sometime in the early 1990's. Prior to that, documentation shows the brick structure and former additions were painted white.

3. The applicant is proposing to paint the main body of the house Rookwood Terra Cotta (SW2803); the exterior wood trim Renwick Beige (SW 2805); and the front door Rook Dark Brown (SW 2808).

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Color is a major design element with significant impact upon a building's character. In Worthington some colors are more appropriate than others, depending upon a building's age, style, and setting. The city has a flexible policy giving building owners freedom in color selection but recommends avoiding colors inappropriate for Worthington's architecture.

In the past, color use varied with time period. Early- and mid-19th century buildings often were painted white, but fairly bright colors such as red, blue, yellow, dark green and even orange were used, sometimes as body colors for buildings and sometimes as trim. After about 1860, typical colors included greens, reds, oranges, and olives that were fairly dark and rich. The body color was usually lighter, with trim painted in darker compatible colors; sometimes the opposite was true. Color patterns were simple, usually with only two different colors used for body and trim. Traditionally, bright colors were not used in Worthington.

In the years between about 1880 and 1900, when architectural designs became more complex and ornamental, color followed suit. Three colors on a single building became more common, and there was a re-introduction of lighter colors such as pale yellow or light green that had seen less use during the 1870-1880 period. When combined with darker colors, this created a more varied visual effect that complemented the generally more complex building designs. Blues and grays saw some use as trim colors but generally were not used as body colors.

After about 1900, architectural design entered a period of reaction to the heavy, ornate compositions of the late 19th century. Architects used simpler, plainer designs and turned to the classical forms and ornamentation of the past. In the Colonial Revival and other styles of this period, colors tended to be lighter and cooler, including creams, yellows, grays, and white.

This trend generally continues today. People often prefer lighter rather than darker colors for both body and trim. Indeed, the brighter colors sometimes used in the past often do not seem "right" for today's tastes. Even on older buildings that might have used brighter colors in the past, lighter color schemes can be appropriate.

In many cases, the colors of unpainted brick walls are the base colors, and trim colors should be selected to be compatible with them. In general, on buildings with dark red brick walls, darker trim colors such as maroon or dark green are appropriate, while for lighter tan or buff-colored brick, and for stone of similar color, consider yellow, cream, or white trim colors. One long tradition in Worthington has been the use of white or cream-colored trim on red-brick houses. On more recent buildings follow these same rules of thumb, depending on the basic wall material color.

Recommendations - Before re-painting, research original paint colors. It is possible to chip or scrape down through paint layers to expose earlier colors. Once historic paint layers are exposed, match current color chips for color selection (most paint stores and manufacturers have "historic" paint palettes designed for older buildings). If original colors can't be discovered or are

unacceptable, then consider alternate colors chosen according to the time-period guidelines above or from color palettes developed for use on historic buildings.

Recommendation:

Re-painting the Kingsley Ray house the same color, or going back to white, would be the easiest choices for paint color as both have been used on the structure. The proposed Terra Cotta shade seems like an attempt to look like natural brick, which would be a difficult look to recreate on a painted brick building. Additional research, as recommended in the Design Guidelines, may be warranted.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dan Srsic, 694 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he was representing the Worthington Presbyterian Church at 753 High Street, in regards to the Kingsley Ray house. He said a hallmark of Presbyterian Church governance is reliance on committees for decision making. He has been involved with a continuous process since 2017, and their committee came up with a color scheme which may be more suitable for the building and hopefully acceptable by the Board members.

Mr. Srsic said the committee had an on-site discussion with Mr. Foust and some painting professionals from Creative Paints to talk about the choices in maintaining the historic nature of the building with a different paint scheme than what is already on the building. The advice they received for the main color for the building focused on grays and earth tones with the idea the color should be selected from the Williamsburg Collection or a palette with similar historic colors. They took additional time to look at the color scheme and compared with residential and commercial buildings around the Worthington area, and they also considered the two neighboring buildings. Mr. Srsic said they would like to propose the main color of the building be Finney Gray which was the main exterior color of the Finney House in Williamsburg, Virginia, a very popular color in the 18th century. The proposed trim color is Parish White is also a color from the Williamsburg palette. The color was used on the trim of the Bruton church in Williamsburg and would look nice on the Kingsley Ray House. Paint samples were distributed to the Board members. Mr. Srsic said blue was the suggested color for the door.

Mrs. Holcombe asked what the objection was to keep the current color. Mr. Srsic replied the committee decided the current color was not a good choice moving forward and after reading through Worthington's Design Guidelines, there is a transition moving away from darker colors and they felt a lighter color would look better. Mr. Foust asked if the paint could be cleaned off of the front of the stone base and leave the limestone naturally exposed. Mr. Srsic said they want the building to look as good as possible so that is something they would definitely consider. Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the effort for what is being done to preserve and maintain the building, and he liked the proposed colors Mr. Srsic presented. Mr. Srsic asked for one accommodation in the motion in regards to removal of the paint on the stone as long as lead remediation is not necessary. Mr. Coulter suggested water blasting the stone instead of sand blasting because sand blasting might damage the stone and surrounding brick. If cleaning the stone is going to be a major obstacle, we would ask that we could still continue to paint. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward. Mr. Srsic invited everyone in the community to church services on Sunday at 10:00 a.m.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO PAINT THE KINGSLEY RAY HOUSE AT 753 HIGH ST. WITH THE COLORS AS PRESENTATED AT THE MEETING, AND THAT THE STONE FOUNDATION BE WATER BLASTED SO THAT THE NATURAL STONE COLOR IS EXPRESSED AS AT APPROXIMATELY THE HEIGHT OF THE FRONT PORCH PER CASE NO. AR 66-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 66-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

6. Wall Sign – 693 ½ High St., Unit 102 (Lynn Winegardner/W Glow Bar) AR 68-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

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

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

Project Details:

1. A 10” x 22” wall sign is proposed east of the blue entry door, and below the existing College Bound Advantage sign which is the same size.
2. The new sign would be constructed of sandblasted HDU, and would identify “W glowbar”. The proposed sign would have a white background with a yellow raised circle with a “W” and black and yellow raised text.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of the proposed sign. The material would look like wood, and be in character with the building and Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Lynne Winegardner, 4190 Colister Dr., Dublin, Ohio. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LYNN WINEGARDNER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL SIGN AT 693 ½ HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 68-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 68-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

7. Shed, EV Charging Stations, Bollard – **80 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (McDonald’s USA, LLC)
AR 69-18 (Amendment to AR 26-18 & AR 15-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

McDonald’s has operated at this location since 1979 and looks substantially as approved by the ARB. The drive-thru was added in 1982, and other minor site, signage and lighting modifications have been made over the years. The property is about 1.58 acres in area.

A proposal to demolish the existing building and construct a new restaurant with a drive-thru was approved at the March 22, 2018 ARB/MPC meeting, and lighting was approved on April 26, 2018.

This application is a request for approval of a shed and EV charging stations.

Project Details:

1. A 10’ x 17’ shed is proposed adjacent to the east side of the dumpster enclosure to store outdoor maintenance equipment. Brick to match the building and the enclosure is proposed for the walls. The roof material has not yet been identified and a sketch has been requested. Parking and landscaping were revised to accommodate the structure.
2. Two EV charging stations are proposed on the south side next to the shed. Specifications and proposed signage are included in the packet. The stations would be 19” wide x 5” deep with adjustable height up to 60”, and include a touch screen display with advertising opportunities. Two 18” high x 12” wide green and white signs would be installed to mark

the spaces.

3. A bollard to match the others proposed for the site would be at the northeast corner of the shed.
4. Variances would be needed for the shed, charging stations, and bollard in the required side yard; changeable copy on the charging station displays; and likely the height of the directional signs. Application has been made to the BZA.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

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.

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.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed items are appropriate for this site. Use of the displays on the charging stations should be limited to customers paying for their use, rather than continual advertising.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Rebecca Green, representing Permit Solutions, Inc., 175 S. Third St., Suite 170, Columbus, Ohio, said the owner would like the shed to store maintenance equipment. The structure would be complimentary to the building and built with brick and matching colors for the bollards. The two charging stations were to be of a darker color, but not lime green. She understands that a multitude of variances are needed for signage. The charging stations will be for electric cars to recharge and they will be single units. Mr. Coulter asked if the elevation of the backside of the dumpster and the proposed building, would it be a single wall, or a bump out. Mr. Foust stated that he did not see the board members getting behind the advertisement on the charging stations. Mr. Myers asked a question related to the changeable

copy on these charging stations, would we require a variance on a gasoline pump. Ms. Bitar responded that the Code was modified to address this issue. Mr. Myers stated that sustainability is very important to City Council, and this goes towards their goals. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MCDONALD’S USA, LLC TO AMEND CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 15-18 & AR 26-18 BY ADDING A SHED, EV CHARGING STATIONS AND A BOLLARD TO THE APPROVED PLANS FOR THE NEW RESTAURANT AT 80 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE SHED WILL BE A CONTINUOUS WALL ON THE SOUTH SIDE; THERE WILL BE TWO SINGLE EV CHARGING UNITS OF A NATURAL COLOR AND NOT LIME GREEN; AND NO CHANGEABLE COPY ADVERTISING TO BE USED. THE MANUFACTURE’S NAME IS PERMITTED TO BE ON THE EV CHARGING UNIT.

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

8. Signage – 918 High St. (Tracey Diehl/CVS) AR 67-18

The applicant requested to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table this application, seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the application was tabled.

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Signage & Awnings – 918 High St. (Tracey Diehl/CVS) ADP 07-18

The applicant requested to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table this application, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the application was tabled.

2. Conditional Use Permit

a. Vocational Instruction in I-1 – 510 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Carney Ranker Architects/ ResCare) CU 10-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This building is part of the Rush Creek development and is located on the western side of the property. The building has two stories and was constructed in the early 1980's. The 11.7 acre property is in the I-1 Zoning District.

This is a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow vocational training in the building.

Project Details:

1. A company called ResCare is planning to locate at this building. ResCare provides social services to people with disabilities.
2. The space would largely be used as an office, with areas to provide daily living support services and vocational training.
3. Hours of operation are cited as normal business hours. The number of trainees and mode of transportation have not been identified, but parking and room in the facility should be ample to accommodate the business according to the applicant.
4. No exterior changes to the building or site are proposed.

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.

Worthington Codified Ordinances

1123.77 Vocational Instruction.

“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.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. There should be minimal effect on traffic patterns; public facilities; sewerage and drainage facilities; and utilities. No safety or health considerations or environmental hazards have been identified.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brad Kitchen, representing Rush Creek Investors, 300 Spruce St., Columbus, Ohio, said their clients will arrive by van because most of are adults with disabilities so there should not be a problem with parking or traffic. There will only be a few adults arriving at one time. Board members did not have any questions or concerns.

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

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CARNEY RANKER ARCHITECTS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION BUSINESS IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 510 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 10-18, DRAWINGS NO. CU 10-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, 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.

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

3. Wilson Bridge Corridor – Final Plan

a. Multi-family Residential – 181 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Oxford Circle LLC) WBC 01-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

City Council adopted Wilson Bridge Road Corridor (WBC) zoning in 2016 to reflect the planning working that was done for the corridor. Last year approval was granted to rezone this property as WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential to match the zoning district created and recommended for this property as part of the corridor planning. Single family residential properties are located east, west and south of the property. The property to the west was designated for professional office and the parcel to the east was to be medium density residential per the WBC zoning. Commercial property is to the north.

The property consists of two parcels totaling approximately +/- 2.05 acres on the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. just east of the center of the block. The vacant properties are lots 16 & 17 of the Northhigh Acres subdivision, which was created in 1923. The parcels are identified by numbers 100-002477 (Lot #16) & 100-002478 (Lot #17). Lot #16 is also known as 181 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. as there was a house on the lot from about 1995 – 2011. Lot #17 has always been vacant. The parcels would be combined as part of this request to develop multi-family residential.

A Preliminary Plan to develop the property was approved at the MPC’s June 28th meeting. The applicant is now asking for a recommendation to the City Council of approval of the Final Plan. **Modifications since the Preliminary Plan approval are shown below in bold.**

Project Details:

1. Site Layout.

- Two buildings are proposed for the site at the north and south ends with parking between.
- The northern structure (Building 1) would be located ~32' from the street, and parallel to the street. **The existing right-of-way line is 10.1' from the back of curb, and the city is requesting an additional 15' of right-of-way for future location of a recreation path. The setback of Building 1 from the new property line would be about 7'.** Sidewalk and steps are proposed along the front of the building to provide access to the individual units. Building 1 is proposed about 40' from the west property line and 25' from the east property line. Variances would be required for the building to be closer than 50' from an "R" District for the proximity to the side property lines. If the corridor had all been rezoned to match the WBC districts, variances would not be needed.
- The southern structure (Building 2) is proposed 50' from the south property line, and ~14' from the east and west property lines. Sidewalk is proposed around the entire building, with walkways to each unit entrance. Variances would be required for the building to be closer than 50' from an "R" District for the proximity to the side property lines. If the corridor had all been rezoned to match the WBC districts, variances would not be needed. The rear setback meets the requirement.
- West of Building 1 would be a 25' wide drive entrance that is wider than the 30' at the curb line allowed by Code in residential districts, and the 45' width allowed in all other districts. If the drive is not narrowed a variance would be needed. The drive would continue to form a rectangular loop between the buildings that allows 22' wide two-way access to 58 parking spaces. The proposed parking is adjacent to the buildings' sidewalks; 30' from the west property line; and on both sides of the northern and eastern parts of the drive. A 7-car garage is proposed about 25' from the east property line.
- Sidewalk would connect from the southern building along the west side of the parking to the front property line. The area inside the rectangle would also have sidewalk and house the mail boxes for the units.
- Bicycle racks are proposed at the northeast corner of Building 1, and the northwest corner of Building 2.
- Two benches are proposed in front of and centered on Building 1.
- Screening for the "R" properties to the south is proposed with existing and proposed landscape material. A combination of Spruce trees 6' – 7' tall at planting and grasses are proposed to be added near the property line, and 6 healthy trees would remain south of the building. **A 6' high solid cedar privacy fence is proposed along the south property line.**
- Trees to be preserved on the site total 404 caliper inches. In addition to the trees on the south side, trees would be retained in the parking lot island, and along the east and west property lines. Many of the trees slated for removal (\pm 1688 caliper inches) are in poor condition. New trees (343 caliper inches) are proposed for planting along the east property line, in parking lot islands, and in the tree lawn. A variance is requested from the provision requiring \$150 payment for each caliper inch of tree lost and not replaced.
- Shrubs, perennials and grasses are also proposed in planting beds adjacent to the buildings, parking lot, and drive entrance.

- A trash dumpster enclosure is proposed south of the garage. The exact location and screening of other mechanical equipment has not been identified, but is called out as being located to the rear of buildings and screened with walls, fences or landscaping.
- Coverage with impervious surface would be on 1.157 acres of the 2 acre property.
- Utilities are available to the site from main lines in Wilson Bridge Rd.
- **The Fire Department has reviewed an exhibit demonstrating access to the site with the ladder truck, and a fire flow test shows adequate water flow for the hydrants.**

2. Buildings.

- The buildings would have 16 dwelling units each, or 16 units per acre. A variance would be needed to exceed the number of units by 2 per acre.
- **Floor plans show Building 1 would have 4 two-bedroom units at the ends and 4 one-bedroom units in the middle of each floor. For Building 2, the end units would have three bedrooms and the center units would have two bedrooms.**
- Renderings of the buildings and garage have been presented, but all building elevations have not been submitted. Both residential buildings are proposed to be 2 stories in height, with all units being a single level. All units would have a separate entry door, with 8 on each side of the buildings.
- Both buildings would have a gabled roof, with various gabled elements to break up the facades. Some units are proposed with patios or balconies, all of which would have matching railings.
- Materials would consist of Hardiplank board and batten and lap siding, cement board shake siding, brick and asphalt shingles. The windows appear to be double-hung in a 6 over 6 pattern, and would have shutters. Six-panel entry doors and divided light patio doors are proposed. More detail of the materials is needed.
- The garage structure would be a one-story building with a gabled roof. The rendering indicates 7 matching garage doors and an additional wider door at the south end, likely for storage of equipment. The garage is proposed with Hardiplank lap siding and a brick water table. The proposed dumpster enclosure south of the garage appears to be brick with metal doors.

3. Lighting.

- Four pole lights are shown on the north side of Building 1. The poles and **Maxim Lighting 3008** fixtures would be black, **with the poles being 5' in height. The same style of pole and lights are proposed south of Building 2 and near the front drive entrance.**
- **The other proposed fixtures would be Delmar Star Power Optical System mounted on 12' poles. Location of the lights would be mainly between the buildings.**

4. Sign.

- A 16'8" wide by 4'5" tall brick wall is proposed in front of Building 1 at the west end. The wall would have a limestone cap with a rock faced edge, and the brick would be painted to match the lap siding color on the buildings.
- Halo lit cast aluminum 1'6" and 1' high capital letters would identify "Granby Place".

5. Public Spaces.

The applicant shows total building area of ±36,275 square feet, thus requiring 8 Public Space Amenities. The following Public Space Amenities have been identified:

- 3 Bicycle racks
- 4 Decorative light poles
- 2 Benches

Land Use Plans:

Chapter 1181 - Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

Final Plan Requirements.

- A. Upon determination by the Municipal Planning Commission that the proposed WBC application as shown by the preliminary plan conforms to the requirements of this Chapter and all applicable requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, the proponents shall prepare and submit a Final Plan, which plan shall incorporate any changes or modifications required or suggested by the Commission. At the time of filing the Final Plan for review by the Municipal Planning Commission, the applicant shall pay a fee of \$200, no part of which shall be refundable.
- B. The Final Plan submittal shall include the following:
 1. An updated construction schedule;
 2. All items required in the Preliminary Plan, revised as necessary to meet the approval;
 3. Proposed final design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening and other features as required by the City;
 4. Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land to undertake the proposed development; and
 5. Covenants and other restrictions which will be imposed upon the use of the land, Buildings, and Structures, and a copy of any bylaws.
- C. For any development involving the extension of utilities, the owner shall also submit conceptual utility drawings containing the following information:
 1. The pipe size, slope, manholes and location of the sanitary sewer system;
 2. The size, shape and slope for all pipes, channels and basins of the storm sewer system with accompanying storm drainage calculations;
 3. The size and location of water lines and fire hydrants; and
 4. Street or drive grades, cross sections, elevations and contours at two foot intervals.
 5. If a conceptual utility plan is required, the applicant shall pay a fee of \$100.00 per acre for each acre in the development; however, such fee shall not be less than \$300.00 for the purposes of reviewing such utility plans.
- D. If the final plan is found to comply with requirements set forth in this Chapter and other applicable provisions of this Zoning Ordinance, the Commission shall submit such plan with its report and recommendations to the City Council which shall hold a public hearing on the WBC plan.
- E. Following a public hearing, the Council may approve by Ordinance the final plan as submitted by the Commission or may approve modification of the plan if the modification is consistent with the intent and meaning of this Chapter and is in substantial conformity with the Final Plan as approved by the Commission.

Preliminary Plan Requirements:

- a. A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300' of the area proposed for development; Included
- b. Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan; Included
- c. Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site; Included
- d. 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). Included
- e. Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300' of the proposed area; Included
- f. Existing sanitary and storm sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations; Included
- g. 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. Included
- h. A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger; Included
- i. A preliminary grading plan; Included
- j. 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; Included
- k. The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities; Included
- l. 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; Not applicable
- m. Proposed Easements; Not applicable
- n. Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre; Included
- o. Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use; Included
- p. Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase; Needed
- q. Homeowners or commercial owners' association materials; Not applicable
- r. A written narrative describing the project; Included
- s. Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council.

1181.05 WBC Development Standards:

- (a) Site Layout.

- (1) 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.
- A. 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.
 - B. Buildings located along High Street north of Wilson Bridge Road shall be located at least 50' from the adjacent Right-of-Way lines.
 - C. 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.
 - D. Setback areas in front of retail uses shall be primarily hardscaped, and may be used for outdoor dining and other commercial activities. Residential units with individual entries may include landscaping, walkways, porches, raised planters, walls and fences.
 - E. 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.
- (2) Right-of-Way Dedication. Dedication of Right-of-Way may be required to accommodate public improvements.
- (3) 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:
- A. 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.
 - B. 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.

- (4) 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.
 - (5) Tract Coverage. A maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.
 - (6) 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.
- (b) Buildings. Building design should enhance the character of the WBC. A diversity of architectural styles is encouraged to provide visual interest and add to the overall appeal of the corridor.
- (1) Design.
 - A. A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road, or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.
 - B. 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. Maximum building height shall be per Section 1181.06 of the Code. 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. To avoid a potential "canyon/tunneling" effect along the corridor, the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping will be required.
 - C. Extensive blank walls that detract from the experience and appearance of an active streetscape should be avoided.
 - D. Details and materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities to the building.
 - E. Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.
 - F. 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.
 - G. Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest should be used.
 - H. 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.
 - (2) Materials.

- A. 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.
 - B. Vinyl siding and other less durable materials should not be used.
 - C. Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
 - D. The material palette should provide variety and reinforce massing and changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
 - E. Especially durable materials on ground floor façades should be used.
 - F. Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.
 - G. 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.
 - H. The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
- (3) Windows and Doors.
- A. 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.
 - B. Walls adjacent to the primary building frontage, shall have the pattern of window glass continued from the primary building frontage a minimum distance of 10'.
 - C. Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building's architectural style.
 - D. 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'.
- (c) Landscaping. There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.
- (1) Natural Features: Natural Features shall not be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed without approval per the procedures in Section 1181.07. 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 \$150.00 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.
 - (2) Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.
 - (3) 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.
 - (4) Street trees shall be provided.
 - (5) Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.
 - (6) Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.

- (7) The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.
- (d) 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.
- (1) The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.
 - (2) 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.
 - (3) For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.
 - (4) 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.
- (e) Signs.
- (1) General.
 - A. All new signs, including sign face replacement, shall be subject to the provisions herein.
 - B. The provisions in Chapter 1170 shall apply to all signs in the WBC unless otherwise stated in this section.
 - C. Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.
 - (2) Freestanding Signs
 - A. 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.
 - B. 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.
 - C. Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.
 - D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.
- (f) Parking.
- (1) Design. Surface parking shall be located to the rear or side of the buildings on the site. If parking is located on the side of the building, parking shall not exceed 2 rows of parking with a drive aisle between, shall not exceed 60' of street frontage, shall be located no closer to the Right-of-Way than the building, and shall be screened from view from the Right-of-Way.
 - (2) 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.
 - (3) Residential Uses. There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.
 - (4) Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.
 - (5) Structured Parking. Structured parking shall be permitted and encouraged within the WBC, and shall meet all other standards as outlined in this chapter.
- (g) 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:

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

WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential:

An area along the WBC that allows for medium density residential housing, offering a variety of housing styles and pricing options that complement the residential and architectural patterns and styles in the City.

- (1) Permitted Uses: Multi-family dwellings, Home Occupations, Public uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.
- (2) Maximum Building Height: Three stories except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30’.
- (3) Density: The maximum number of dwelling units allowed per acre for development within the WBD-1 shall be 14, with a desired number between 10 and 14 dwelling units.

Staff Analysis:

- As the Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts chapter of the Code was planned and adopted, it was anticipated the entire corridor would be rezoned at the same time. The adjacent properties to the east and west were purchased with full knowledge of the plan for the corridor, so this developer should not have to meet setback and screening requirements for being adjacent to “R” districts on those sides.
- Clarification is needed regarding how the placement of a 12” storm sewer on the south side of Building 2 might impact the existing and/or proposed vegetation.
- The proposed materials are appropriate. Building elevations and material samples are needed.
- A variance to waive the tree replacement fee is reasonable given the quality of the trees and the amount of pervious surface for the development. The proposed retention of some existing trees and the planting of new is satisfactory.
- The request for a variance to exceed the allowable number of dwelling units by 2 units/acre is not substantial.
- The width of the driveway is appropriate for Fire Department access.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended the Municipal Planning Commission discuss this request and make a recommendation to the City Council at its July 26th or September 13th meetings. Final review of building elevations and materials is needed.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Hodge, attorney representing Oxford Circle LLC, 8000 Walton Parkway, Suite 260, New Albany, Ohio. Mr. Hodge said this was their third visit before the Board members, and they did their best to be responsive to the comments from the Commission as well as some initial meetings with staff leading up to the submission of the application. He said there were previous discussions about the screening along the western perimeter by the neighbor, and Mr. Kenney Jr. liked the idea of tall arborvitae as opposed to just screening with a board fence. Mr. Don Kenney, Jr., was also present at the meeting to help answer questions. Mr. Coulter said he appreciated all of the architectural changes he felt there was a vast improvement from the last meeting. He felt all of the ARB and MPC issues had been addressed and resolved. Mr. Reis asked to look at the garages along the eastern side of the property, and look at the storage area to be similar, however that is the dumpster location. Mr. Foust asked about the light source for the lighting, you would not see the light source from the neighboring parcels. Ms. Bitar stated that the proposed Spartan junipers would be 8-feet tall at the time of planting. Mr. Coulter stated that he preferred the junipers vs. a fence, and the maintenance of a fence. The landscaping provides year round color, and better screening. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Harold Careins, 173 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, asked if the fence/landscaping could be extended further south. Mr. Hodge said they would prefer to keep an open dialogue and keep the proposal as it exists. If in the future a problem arises, they would address the issue at that time. The proposed treatment is actually more expensive than just doing a wood fence. Mr. Reis liked the idea of the brick posts with the vegetation along the property line. Mrs. Holcombe agreed. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY OXFORD CIRCLE LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL PLAN TO DEVELOP THE PARCELS AT 181 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, AS PER CASE NO. WBC 01-18, DRAWINGS NO. WBC 01-18, DATED JULY 13, 2018, BE RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL 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.

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

D. Other

Mrs. Bitar presented changes to a previously approved project for 665 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust recused himself from the discussion, and stated that he did not wish to be involved in the discussion. The homeowner would like to have casement windows instead of the windows that were previously approved, and would like to change the placement of the windows. Mr. Coulter felt that casement windows would not be appropriate because the house would then have three different styles of windows. Mrs. Holcombe agreed. Mr. Myers stated that he felt uncomfortable with having this discussion. The Board members felt there should be further discussion at the next meeting in September.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.