



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
December 13, 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; David Foust; and Amy Lloyd. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission. Commission member Edwin Hoffmann; and Board member Richard Schuster were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 8, 2018 meeting

Mr. Foust moved to approve the minutes and Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. All members voted “Aye” and the minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished

1. ATMs, Façade changes, Signage & Lighting – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Bank of America, N.A.) **AR 96-18**

C. Municipal Planning Commission – Unfinished

1. Conditional Use Permit
 - a. Drive-in Bank in C-2 – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Bank of America, N.A.) **CU 16-18**

&

2. Amendment to Development Plan

a. ATM Only Building – 54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Bank of America, N.A.) ADP 08-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This outbuilding on the Shops at Worthington Place property has always functioned as a financial institution, most recently Telhio Credit Union. This request by Bank of America is the first time the space is proposed to be used without employees, with the only bank functions being accomplished with Automated Teller Machines (ATMs).

After discussion at the October 25th ARB meeting, the applicant has submitted some modifications, which are addressed in bold in this memorandum.

Project Details:

1. Two ATMs are proposed for the site, one for walk-up traffic and one for drive-thru traffic.
 - The walk-up ATM is proposed in place of the front door facing W. Wilson Bridge Rd. The proposal involves removing the existing vestibule, and installing an ATM machine with a red surround and Bank of America sign at the top. The plan has been revised to include a full height window that would act as an egress door to the right of the proposed ATM in the center, and a shorter window to the left. The aluminum infill around the ATM is now proposed to be white. The ATM would continue to have a red perimeter frame with red LED halo lighting, and an illuminated topper with blue “Bank of America” lettering and a blue and red logo.
 - The second ATM is proposed beneath the drive-thru canopy at the rear of the building. This machine is also proposed with a sign at the top, with the illuminated topper being framed in red. Also, logos are proposed on the sides of the topper. Roughly 4 ½’ wide by 7 ¾” high directional signs are proposed on the edge of the canopy. Bollards are proposed to protect the machine, and would be gray with narrow red stripes.
2. A wall sign is proposed to be mounted in place of the existing sign box (24 sf in area). Now proposed is a 90” wide x 37 ¼” high (~24 sf in area) aluminum box painted to match the brick, with white letters mounted on the face to identify “Bank of America”, a logo, and “ATM”. The lettering and logo are proposed to be halo lit.
3. A new sign box is proposed to top the existing pole in front of the building. The existing sign box on the pole is 14 sf in area per side. Previously proposed was a new box centered on the pole, and being 6’ 8 ¾” x 3’ 10 ¾” (26 sf in area per side), and tan in color. Now, the proposed 80 ½” wide x 40 7/8” high (~23 sf in area) tan box would extend out toward the street from the pole, having concave sign faces that are 71 ¾” wide x 34 7/8” high. The faces are proposed with an opaque white background, and blue lettering and a blue and red logo. The pole is proposed to be wrapped in 1’8” wide tan material.
4. Building trim is proposed to be repaired to match the existing. Retention of the windows is planned, although a film is proposed on the interior to obscure the view. A photograph of a storefront with similar treatment is included in the packet.

5. New lighting is proposed for the site and building.
 - In an effort to comply with the Code requirements, eight 15’ high bronze poles with fixtures were previously proposed around the site. The plan resulted in higher than allowable and desired light levels, and poles in the parking area. Now, the plan calls for changing the fixtures on the existing 25’ tall pole in front of the building and on 2 poles behind the building, and adding 25’ high poles on both sides of the building. The pole on the east side would be in the parking lot and is proposed to be protected with bollards. It is not clear what the fixture style and base height are for the new poles, or how the existing pole fixtures are being revised. An average of 2.8 footcandles at 3’ above grade is indicated for the light level in the parking areas. The color temperature is proposed as 4000K.
 - New canopy light fixtures are proposed, also being 4000K LED, and producing up to 14 footcandles of light.
 - It appears new lights are proposed above the walk-up ATM, but the drawings do not specify what fixtures would be used.
6. Variances would be required as part of the Amendment to Development plan as follows:
 - More than 1 wall mounted sign per business – In addition to the proposed wall sign on the west side, signs are proposed on the top of the walk-up ATM; and on the front and sides of the drive-up ATM topper, for a total of 5 wall-mounted signs.
 - Light poles are required to be no higher than 15’ as part of the Wilson Bridge Corridor Development Standards. The proposed poles are 25’.
 - Light levels are not to exceed 3 footcandles and the level at the property lines cannot exceed 0 footcandles. The proposed plan shows 14 footcandles under the canopy, and an average of 1.2 footcandles at the property lines.

Land Use Plans:

Architectural District and Development Plan Ordinances

The Board should review the exterior detail and relationship of the changes to existing sites and building. Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade.

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Chapter 1181 - Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

1181.05 Development Standards.

(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.
- (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.
 - D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.
 - (3) Wall-mounted Signs
 - A. 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.

Worthington Code 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
2. Effect on public facilities
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities
4. Utilities required
5. Safety and health considerations
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
7. Hours of use
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood

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.

Staff Analysis:

1. The proposed full height window on the right side of the ATM still does not have the feel of an “operational entry facing the street.” Red illumination around the ATM on the front of the building is not appropriate for the District.
2. The illuminated topper panel with signs on the front and sides for the drive-thru ATM should not be permitted.
3. Ideally, the west side wall sign would be just individually mounted letters, rather than with a backer box. The size is more acceptable than previously proposed.
4. The proposed freestanding sign is larger than the existing former sign, and is not preferred on a 12’ high pole. Also, design similar to the proposed wall sign with individual letters that are halo lit should be considered.
5. The improvements to the building are appropriate. The use of interior blinds rather than placing film on the windows may provide a more typical look for the District.
6. Although 25’ light poles were approved for the main parking lot for the Shops at Worthington Place, smaller areas should be of a different scale that is more fitting the location. Shorter light poles would be more appropriate in this location. If the applicant would keep the existing, it is not clear why the fixtures are proposed to change.
7. The effect based on Conditional Use Permit Standards and Review Elements should be minimal with an unmanned facility, however expected traffic numbers have not been reported.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the drive-thru ATM without the topper; the directional signs for the drive-thru; and the building repairs. The ATM on the front of the building still portrays a look that is not common or appropriate for the District. Redesign of the freestanding sign is desired. Variances are not warranted for the proposed lighting plan. Shorter poles would fit the look desired for the corridor. The Conditional Use permit should be approved. Variances needed as part of the Amendment to Development Plan may not be warranted.

Discussion:

Mr. Paul Wolenski, 55 E. Case Dr., Hudson, Ohio 44236, said he was representing Bank of America. Mr. Wolenski said he and his staff discussed the comments made at the October meeting and he wanted to clarify a few things. He asked Mrs. Bitar to refer to the elevation drawing of the walk-up. Mr. Wolenski said he wanted to point out the full-length window on the right was actually a door. They would like to propose an egress door and still want to remove the vestibule so people realize the building is not a full service bank. They do not want to have customers

entering through a door but they could still maintain a door on the right hand side and use that for egress purposes. Mr. Wolenski agreed the surrounding panels did not have to be lit up and the same with the topper for the ATM. Mr. Wolenski said they would prefer to keep the signage as is and would pursue any necessary variances. They would like to keep the walk-up surround as well as the topper on the drive-up, but both pieces do not need to be internally illuminated.

Mr. Wolenski said they down sized the wall sign to be compliant with the previous approval. The channel letters would have been difficult to adhere to the wall because that is where the bank's vault was formerly located. The bank preferred to go with a pan to mount the letters and conceal the lights to allow for halo illumination. In regards to the pylon sign, Mr. Wolenski said it was his understanding from their sign company that the sign is compliant per Code. The new sign is shorter and smaller than the sign that is there now. He said he provided the cut sheets which explained how the sign would be internally lit. The face will be opaque, likely aluminum with have routed letters. One other adjustment made was "ATM" was added to the sign.

Mr. Wolenski said most banks have requirements for ATM lighting. The current pole heights on the site are 25 ft., so they are requesting a variance to match the existing pole heights because meeting the bank's lighting requirement would be difficult with the shorter pole heights. He also felt the shorter poles would look odd since the rest of the site has 25 ft. light poles.

Mr. Wolenski brought window film samples to distribute to the Board members. Mrs. Bitar asked if there were any logos in the frosted application. Mr. Wolenski said there were in the second application, but they are proposing the first application which did not contain logos. Mrs. Bitar asked about the rear ATM and if that ATM would still have a topper and be illuminated. Mr. Wolenski said yes, normally the ATM would be illuminated, however, they can agree to no illumination there, but would like relief for the signage proposed. He said they would like the signage and the logos on the sides, but have agreed not to illuminate the surrounds and the toppers even though Chase Bank has the illumination. Mrs. Bitar explained the City is pursuing Chase bank's violation. Mr. Coulter suggested the Board members go down the check list, and reminded them whatever decisions were made at the ARB level, the variances would need to be approved by City Council.

Mr. Foust said the Board is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improvements that enhance the village like character of the community, which is about impossible with this building because of the proposed use. He said he agreed with the City's staff recommendations and wanted to start with the front entrance. Mr. Foust said he was uncertain what to do about the door and windows. He asked Mr. Wolenski if he still wanted to have a door to maintain the building. Mr. Wolenski said their original proposal did not include a front door, they had proposed to use the side door to service the ATM, which is sufficient for egress purposes. Mr. Foust said he was not excited about the look; Mr. Coulter and Mrs. Holcombe felt the proposed was the best option to have two doors. Mr. Foust asked if the halo lighting around the ATM would not be used and asked if there would be overhead lighting in the canopy. Mr. Wolenski said, "Yes."

Mr. Coulter said the next item is the elimination of the illuminated topper panel for the ATMs. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Wolenski if he agreed not to illuminate the topper panels and Mr. Wolenski said that was correct.

Mr. Coulter said the next item was the west side wall sign. Wall mounted letters were originally suggested rather than a backer box but the reason for not doing that was because the bank's safe was located behind the wall and it would be difficult to install the letters and get conduit to the sign. Mr. Wolenski said that was correct. Mr. Foust verified there was a sign panel there before, and this proposed was smaller.

Mr. Coulter said the next item was the freestanding sign, and it was his understanding Mr. Wolenski was proposing a slightly smaller sign than what is there now. Mr. Wolenski said that was correct. Mr. Coulter asked if the new sign would be the same height, or the same as the one that is there now. Mr. Wolenski said their sign vendor put together a rough schematic, but they are proposing the sign to be 12 ft. high which is not as tall as the current sign. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Wolenski to describe how the letters would work. Mr. Wolenski explained what was proposed came from a standardized family of signs by the bank. He would request something that is not the bank's standard, would be an aluminum cabinet, routed letters, and acrylic push-through letters. Mr. Wolenski did not have a drawings, but could verbally agree to that.

Mr. Coulter read "the improvements to the building were appropriate, the use of the interior blinds rather than placing film on the windows provided a more typical look for the district." He then asked if anyone had an issue with the film that was proposed which would be a frosted look. Mr. Foust said as long as the film does not have a metallic look he would be okay with that.

Mr. Coulter said the next item for discussion was the 25 ft. light poles which were approved for the parking lot at the Shops of Worthington Place. Mr. Brown said City Council adopted the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Plan and all of the zoning to be in place with the goal that as soon as things started to be redeveloped they would have to meet Code. Mrs. Bitar explained that would be 15 ft. maximum for pole lights. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the two new poles were only 15 ft., would that look odd since they would not match the rest of the existing light poles? Mr. Foust said City Council members worked very hard on a plan, and he felt they should stick with the recommendations made by City Council, and not give them something they will have to vote for a variance. He also suggested replacing all of the light poles on the bank's site with 15 foot light poles. Mr. Wolenski said they could probably come up with a design to add the 15 ft. light poles, but Bank of America is leasing the property, and he could not speak for the owner of the property who recently added the new 25 ft. light poles. Mr. Brown said the light poles could stay as they are now, just no new poles. Mrs. Bitar reiterated the light poles can remain as they are now, or all of the light poles can be changed to 15 ft. Mr. Wolenski said the other option is lights on the building, and Mrs. Bitar said that would not be acceptable for lighting the parking area. Mr. Wolenski said he would work with City staff to come up with a feasible light plan. Mr. Coulter explained they could remove the light poles from the application. Mr. Coulter suggested talking with the mall owner to come up with a lighting plan.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if there needed to be more discussion about using the existing monument structure and Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the use of the existing structure. Mrs. Bitar explained the monument sign would be 3 feet shorter than the existing sign. Mr. Coulter said he did not have any problems concerning the proposed bollards. Mr. Brown asked the Board

members if they were okay with the logos on the ATM at the rear of the building. Mr. Foust asked if it was agreed the logos would not be illuminated and Mrs. Lloyd said that was correct.

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

ARB Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE BUILDING AND SITE FOR USE AS AN UNMANNED ATM FACILITY AT 54 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 96-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 96-18, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT THE FRONT ENTRY WILL HAVE NO ILLUMINATION AROUND THE ATM;**
- **THAT THE ATM TOPPERS WILL HAVE NO ILLUMINATION;**
- **THAT THE WINDOWS WILL HAVE INTERNAL FROSTING OF A NON-METALLIC AND NON-REFLECTING MATERIAL;**
- **ALL SIGNS ON THE SITE WILL HAVE OPAQUE BACKGROUNDS;**
- **REMOVE THE POLE LIGHT PORTION OF THE APPLICATION FOR FUTURE REVIEW.**

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

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said staff felt traffic would not increase with this use, and parking would not matter.

Conditional Use Permit Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE THE BUILDING AND SITE FOR USE AS AN UNMANNED ATM FACILITY AT 54 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 16-18, DRAWINGS NO. CU 16-18, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

Discussion:

She said the amendments from the ARB application motion could carry over.

Amendment to Development Plan Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO RENOVATE THE BUILDING AND SITE FOR USE AS AN UNMANNED ATM FACILITY AT 54 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 08-18, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 08-18, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AND AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

- **THAT THE FRONT ENTRY WILL HAVE NO ILLUMINATION AROUND THE ATM;**
- **THAT THE ATM TOPPERS WILL HAVE NO ILLUMINATION;**
- **THAT THE WINDOWS WILL HAVE INTERNAL FROSTING OF A NON-METALLIC AND NON-REFLECTING MATERIAL;**
- **ALL SIGNS ON THE SITE WILL HAVE OPAQUE BACKGROUNDS;**
- **REMOVE THE POLE LIGHT PORTION OF THE APPLICATION FOR FUTURE REVIEW.**

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

D. Architectural Review Board – New

1. Roof Replacement – **580 E. Granville Rd.** (GVS Ohio Holding II, LLC) **AR 105-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

In the late 1990's this property was redeveloped from a lumber company into a personal storage facility. The storage building that was reroofed is located toward the south end of the site, and is visible from further east on E. Granville Rd. This is a request to accept the new roof that was recently installed.

Project Details:

1. The former metal roof on the 7650 square foot building was white.
2. A contractor installed a metal roof this summer that has the appearance of galvanized steel. The product is Galvalume Plus.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed roof color was appropriate for the building and the site.

Discussion:

Angela Ramey, 7821 Taylor Rd. SW, Suite A, Reynoldsburg, Ohio came forward as the applicant. Ms. Ramey said she was initially unaware that her vendor did not replace the roof with the same color. She said the roof appeared to be white while looking at the roof in sunlight. Ms. Ramey said their building is not visible very visible Granville Rd. A person must drive up the hill to see the building. She requested to the leave the roof as the current color. Mr. Foust asked if most of the other storage buildings had dark asphalt shingles and Mrs. Bitar replied, “Yes.” Mr. Foust asked if there were any other plans to replace the roofs on the other units and Ms. Ramey said not at this time. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ANGELA RAMEY ON BEHALF OF GVS OHIO HOLDING II, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN A NEW METAL ROOF AT 580 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 105-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 105-18, DATED NOVEMBER 2, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- 2. Modifications to Previously Approved Plans – **529 High St.** (Jeanne Lennon) **AR 106-18** (Amendment to AR 53-18)

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, and in June of 2018, approval was granted to

extend the rear addition and delete the front addition. At that time the ARB requested the east and north elevations return for approval in the future.

The applicant is hoping now to receive approval of the front and side elevations, and make other revisions to the plans.

Project Details:

1. As previously approved, the owner would like to paint the brick white and use white board and batten cementitious siding in the gables, in a portion of the front, and for the rear addition.
2. Instead of the previously approved black standing seam metal roof, the owner is now proposing a gray roof. A sample is expected at the meeting.
3. The eastern 2/3 of the existing covered porch would continue to be re-used, but would have a sloped standing seam metal roof rather than the existing flat roof. The columns and support beam for the porch roof are now proposed to be square and white.
4. The front of the western 1/3 of the building sidewalk is still proposed to be removed to allow landscaping to be added.
5. In addition to a sign on the front gable consisting of black individually mounted letters illuminated by a gooseneck lamp, a second sign is now proposed on the east side of the building. The design would match the individually mounted black letters on the front of the building, and two black gooseneck lights are proposed for illumination. A variance would be needed for 2 wall signs.
6. Landscaping is proposed in front of the southern half of the eastern wall.

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.
- 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.

- 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 this application, as the proposed amendments were compatible with the previously approved plans. The addition of a second wall sign is supportable with removal of the freestanding sign.

Discussion:

The applicants, Matt Lones, 411 Meditation Ln., Columbus, Ohio, and Ms. Jeanne Lennon, 529 High St., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Mr. Lones said they listened to the Board members comments at the last meeting and made the stained wood look white. They also reduced the size of the corridor so they could eliminate the second egress door. Mr. Lones said they cleaned up the elevation and Ms. Lennon would like to remove the monument sign and have a wall sign instead. Mr. Lones said they were told by the Board members last time that a black standing seam metal roof was too much of a contrast against the white building so they were proposing a gray standing seam metal roof instead. Photographic examples of a gray roof were shown to the Board members. Mr. Foust said he liked the changes and felt the look would be a better fit for the community. Mrs. Holcombe agreed and the Board members were comfortable with the wall sign and removal of the monument sign. Mr. Coulter and Mrs. Lloyd felt the changes were very nice.

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 53-18 WITH DESIGN MODIFICATIONS AT 529 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 106-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 106-18, DATED NOVEMBER 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; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Lighting at Rear Door – **131 W. Stafford Ave.** (Jen & Kyle Goebbel) **AR 107-18**
(Amendment to AR 08-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Constructed in the 1920's, this English Cottage Revival house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The applicant received approval to replace the pediment and trim for the front door, and to add a patio door to the rear in February of this year. At the meeting, it was mentioned lights to match the fixtures on the front would be installed adjacent to the new rear door, but the lights that were installed are a different style. Also, a complaint was received from a neighboring property owner about the light level. This is a request for approval to keep the rear lights.

Project Details:

1. The installed lights are made by Quoizel and part of its Lighthouse collection. The fixtures are glass that is framed with metal in a Palladian Bronze finish. The wattage on the specification sheet is 150 watts.
2. The homeowners indicate the lights are attached to a dimmer switch, and have been kept at the dimmest setting since hearing of the neighbor's complaint.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

In selecting new light fixtures, simple designs are usually the best. Avoid overly ornate fixtures and ones that are out of scale with the building. Select fixtures appropriate to the building's character or that are similar to those used on buildings from the same period or style. Use as few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light for walks, yards and driveways. Avoid overly bright lights. Locate and orient fixtures to minimize light "spill" onto adjacent properties. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The light fixtures were traditional looking and seemed appropriate in this location.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said there was a correction to project details. The homeowner was using a 60 watt bulb, not 150 watt.

Jen and Kyle Goebbel, 131 W. Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio came forward as the applicants. Mrs. Goebbel said she was before the Board last spring before starting their project. She was undecided about which door she would choose, but also needed to add landscaping to her project and a fixture for the exterior door. She said she wanted the fixture to be the same style to match what was already existing on her home. Mrs. Goebbel said she received a complaint from the neighbors after the project was completed. They complained the lights were keeping them awake at night and they wanted to keep their windows open. Mrs. Goebbel said they have two small children and they are often awake in the middle of the night. She said she did not like having a dark yard because she could not see anything in the yard. She wanted to be neighborly, but did not like having to turn the lights off. The purpose of the lights were for security reasons. Back in August or September 2018, their cars and many of the neighbors' cars were broken into. Mrs. Goebbel said she had a conversation with her school resource officer and was told she lived in a

highly visible area and it was important for her to keep exterior lighting on. From that point on, for her family's safety and security, they felt better keeping the exterior lights on. They had a dimmer switch installed and have kept the lights at the lowest setting possible. Mrs. Goebbel said she felt she had the right as a property owner, and on a corner lot, to keep the property lit up, and that is why she felt she needed to discuss this with the Board.

Mr. Goebbel said any reasonable person who looked at the photographs shown could see how dark their yard is. He said when he looks out the door, he can barely see his patio with the light dimmed. Mr. Goebbel felt with a reasonable blind there should not be a quality of life change for the neighbor.

Mr. Foust thought there were two questions, the first being the style change of the fixture, and the second question was the intensity of the lighting. Mr. Coulter said that was correct. Mr. Foust said he had no problem at all with the style of the fixture. Mr. Foust asked the Goebbels if they had any more conversations with the neighbor since the dimming switch was installed. Mrs. Goebbel explained the dimming switch was installed from the beginning, but she explained to her neighbor their cars had been broken into and the Worthington Police Department told her to keep her exterior lighting on in the evenings. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Seth and Lori Cramer, 806 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, came forward. Mr. Cramer apologized in advance for the length of his statement, but he felt this was important because it does impact their life. He said this was the first time he has ever been at a meeting where he crafted words beforehand because he felt when dealing with neighbors he should be exact and not get off the path because at the end of the day they would still like to be cordial with their neighbors. Mr. Cramer said the lighting that is there now is not something that is conducive to his family having a quality of life at night. He said he felt they should be able to have lighting. Mr. Cramer said he did try to talk with the Goebbels, as Mrs. Goebbel mentioned earlier. He said he was rebuffed by his neighbors to come up with a solution that addresses their security and his family's need for quality of life.

Mr. Cramer said the patio lights left on all night shine into his bedroom window and effects his ability to sleep during warm summer months. He said he likes being able to let fresh air into his home, and he has lived in his home for twenty-seven years without having to worry about having excessive light coming in. With his neighbor's patio lights on, he has no choice but to close the window. Mr. Cramer said his wife's bedroom window is not as affected because the light is blocked by the back of the neighbor's garage. Mr. Cramer said for background, as long as the Goebbels have lived next door, they have kept lights on outside leaving on the ones in the soffit at the front of their garage. Mr. Cramer referred Mrs. Bitar to show a specific photograph of garage lights only. He said those lights shine across the property, but the light source cannot be seen from his house. Mr. Cramer said after the installation of the brick patio the patio lights were left on and this was in addition to the garage lights.

Mr. Cramer said on May 22nd, after a couple days of having both the patio and garage lights on, he contacted his neighbors to see if they would shut off the patio lights at night. The patio lights were left off until late August, allowing him to enjoy fresh air and much better sleep. The lights

came back on after Mr. Goebbel's unlocked parked car was broken into and a wallet was stolen. Mr. Cramer heard about deterrence methods other than lighting, and reached out to the Ohio Crime Prevention Association. He said that morning he received a response that he read, which mentioned conditions that could attract crimes such as open garage doors, accumulated mail, unsecured property, and unlocked vehicles. The letter indicated much of residential crime takes place during the day, but can be further deterred with security systems and cameras, and reasonable exterior lighting, including motion sensor lights. Mr. Cramer said on August 26th, he contacted Mr. Goebbel about the impact the lights were having on his quality of life. Mr. Goebbel expressed his concern for family safety, which Mr. Cramer fully understood and appreciated. Mr. Cramer said he offered suggestions and offered financial support to make changes. Mr. Cramer said he sent a second text message to Mr. Goebbel with another idea, but Mr. Goebbel responded the lights were approved and staying on. Mr. Cramer said upon the realization that the lighting was never approved, he hoped this evening's meeting provided an opportunity for the Architectural Review Board to come up with a lighting solution that takes into account all needs as part of the approval process. Mr. Cramer showed a photograph of what the patio lights looked like from the previous night. Mr. Cramer said this was the first time he was aware the lights had been lowered. He said his wife recently mentioned the lights looked dimmer than they were before. Mr. Cramer said if there was no agreed solution like turning the lights off at night or have them on a motion sensor, he suggested the Board take a look at the option of down lighting. Mr. Cramer again offered a monetary amount to help defer the cost towards a solution of one-half of the cost up to \$200. He wanted neighbor relations to be cordial.

Mr. Foust said it was his understanding Mr. Cramer was not affected by the garage lights, and Mr. Cramer said that was correct. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Cramer if he was okay with the dimmed lights or if he was asking to have the porch lights off. Mr. Cramer said even when the lights are dimmed, the lights are still broadcasted into his bedroom.

Mr. Ron Richardson, 1454 Parkridge Dr., said he was hired by the Goebbels to be their contractor. Mr. Richardson said he grew up in Worthington area, and was asked by Mrs. Goebbel to stop by their house before the meeting. Mr. Richardson said he stood in the line of sight from Mrs. Goebbel's doorway and turned around to her neighbor's door and he saw Mr. Cramer's front porch lights. He said he saw two lights on Mr. Cramer's front porch and two lights on Mrs. Goebbel's back porch. He did not understand why Mr. Cramer did not want his neighbor to have porch lights. Mr. Richardson said he stopped by the house again before the meeting, and it was dark outside. He drove past the McConnell Arts Center and all of their glass is totally illuminated and there is also an LED in front of the high school. There are also lights on the high school as janitors leave in the evening. He noticed the newly built house on the corner of Evening St. and Clearview Ave. also had rear porch lights which were extremely illuminated. Mr. Richardson suggested Mr. Cramer putting up blinds over the window to block the light.

Mr. Cramer said he appreciated Mr. Richardson's comments but he felt they were irrelevant because he was talking about lights lit up overnight. Mr. Cramer reiterated he was not asking for his neighbors' lights to be removed. He said he does have rear porch lights but he does not put on the rear porch lights at night because he wants his neighbor to have the same quality of life as he has. Mr. Cramer said he wanted to be clear, he did not have any issues with porch lights. He said all he is asking for is a solution that allows them to have that side of their house illuminated, which

their garage lights adequately do, and if they want a solution, he suggested having the lights come on by motion sensors overnight. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Myers, the City Council Representative if he had any suggestions. Mr. Myers asked if there was a distinction between a residential property and a commercial property under the Design Guidelines, and if so, what that distinction is. He said if you looked at a commercial property you look at it much differently. Mrs. Bitar said the Guidelines do address residential lighting if you look under Land Use Plans in the Memo. Some of the language uses few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light, avoid overly bright lights, and locate lights to minimize light spilling onto adjacent properties. Mrs. Bitar felt the light in this situation does not spill onto the neighboring property, but the light source is very visible. Mr. Myers explained if a photometric study were done, there would probably be zero candles at the property line, but they have considered line of sight on commercial properties. He said that was an extensive subject of conversation for the Fresh Thyme project. He said he felt that could be a consideration the Board could think about, but at the end of the day lights are permitted on points of ingress and egress, and are encouraged. Mr. Myers asked if this is a question for the Board, or is this an issue between two neighbors. Mr. Foust said he lives across the city parking lot and you can read a book in his bedroom at night, so he has had to deal with bright light. Mr. Foust said he did not see anything wrong with the style of Goebbels light fixtures or the location on the house. They are perfectly consistent with everything the Board has approved in the community. What he would like to see happen are the two neighbors getting together and agreeing on a solution. Mr. Foust said in his opinion, he felt the lighting on the garage adequately lit the side of the Goebbels house. He also felt the idea of motion detection was also a neighborly solution.

Mrs. Bitar said she felt there have been other situations that have come before the Board where lighting was already installed. She said the lens to look at the project is if the applicant had come to the Board before installing the lighting, would the Board have approved of the lighting? Mr. Foust said he felt the Board probably would have. He said he turns his porch lights off at night when he goes to bed. Someone in the audience said every house on their street has porch lights on all night. Mr. Foust interrupted and said he constantly hears people say at the meetings that someone else is doing something so they think they should be allowed to do it, and he felt that is garbage. He said the goal as a community is to improve conditions, not make them worse, or say we want to be like everybody else.

Mr. Reis said he lives in the Westbrook Subdivision, and there are about fifteen houses there, and everyone in his neighborhood leaves their porch and garage lights on all night and every night. Mrs. Bitar asked if Mr. Reis' neighborhood had street lighting and he said, "No." She said that is a very good reason to leave the lights on when there is not any street lighting. She said her subdivision does not have street lights either and they leave their lights on all night as well. Mr. Reis suggested tabling the application and giving the applicant a chance to work something out with her neighbor. He felt there was adequate lighting from the garage lights, and liked the suggestion of motion lights for the back porch.

Mrs. Holcombe said she felt motion detection lights might be more distracting because of the animal population in Worthington. She felt this was an issue between the two neighbors, and the ARB should only be charged with approving the lights, not whether the lights should be off or on. She also felt the garage lights provided adequate lighting for the area, but if they are dimmed that is also a solution. Mrs. Holcombe said you do want to protect your property but you also want to have respect for each other. She felt the neighbors should be able to come to a solution. Either turn the lights off at a certain time, dim them all the way down, and keep the garage lights on all the time. She said she just felt telling someone what to do with their lights is not their job.

Mr. Coulter asked the wattage of the bulbs the Goebbels were using. Mrs. Goebbel said she offered to bring the bulbs to the meeting, the bulbs are 60 watts. She said while amidst compromising, when they purchased the home, there were flood lights on the home that they do not use. She said she felt they have attempted to meet in the middle. She said she purchased black-out blinds for her children and did not feel they were being unreasonable. Mrs. Goebbel would like the Board's approval of the light fixtures that were not submitted back in February. She said they would take care of their neighborly issues themselves. She said she might try keeping the back porch lights off and using the flood lights instead.

Mr. Rob Bruno, 1500 E. Chestnut St., Lancaster, Ohio, said he was waiting for a different application to be heard, but he disagreed 110 percent that the Board members had any authority of telling a property owner how much they could light their back yard. He asked what would give the Board the permission to say a homeowner could not turn their back porch light on.

Mr. Foust said they were being asked to approve the lights, not to settle the dispute between neighbors about the light source.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JEN & KYLE GOEBBEL TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 08-18 BY ADDING LIGHT FIXTURES BESIDE THE NEW REAR DOOR AT 131 W. STAFFORD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 107-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 107-18, DATED NOVEMBER 14 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; Mr. Foust, nay; Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Replace Steps – 675 Morning St. (Ace Fence & Deck/Poteet) AR 108-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is an American Foursquare that was built in 1914. The structure has been added onto over the years, and improvements have been made to the site. This request is for approval to replace the deteriorated front steps, and add a handrail.

Project Details:

1. The front porch is constructed with wood, including lattice skirting, and is painted to match the house. There are four wood steps leading to the porch.
2. Proposed are pressure treated wood steps in the same style, including lattice on the side, that would be painted to match the house when possible.
3. A cedar hand rail or rails are proposed along the sides of the steps. A photographic example of style is included with the packet, but other options have been discussed.

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 spindles were common for railings.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of this application, with the amendment that a more appropriate railing style be used. The example included in the packet had the look of a railing more appropriately located on a rear deck.

Discussion:

The applicant, Rob Bruno, 1500 E. Chestnut St., Lancaster, Ohio, said his client wanted to extend the steps to both sides of the pillars. There will also be railing down both sides of the stairs. Mr. Bruno said the staining will be taken care of by the homeowner. Mrs. Bitar explained the applicant has already agreed to use a specific type of railing as pictures. 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 ACE FENCE AND DECK ON BEHALF OF STEPHEN POTEET FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE FRONT STEPS AND ADD RAILS AT 675 MORNING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 108-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 108-18, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2018, 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. Foust, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Modifications to Previously Approved Plans – **800 Proprietors Rd.** (Kemper House Worthington, LLC) **AR 109-18** (Amendment to AR 23-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

In January of 2018, the City Council approved rezoning the southern 4.84 acres of the former Worthington Foods property as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow for construction of the Kemper House, an Alzheimer's/Dementia/Memory Care Facility. The PUD Final Plan and Architectural Review Board approvals were granted in April of 2018, and the property went through a subdivision process in June of 2018 to prepare for the development.

This application represents amendments to the original ARB approval, but nothing would require an amendment to the PUD.

Project Details:

1. A cedar fence is proposed to screen the mechanical equipment at the northeast corner of the middle building. The fence height is not readable on the drawing, but is assumed to be high enough to completely hide the equipment.
2. A wood equipment screen is also proposed for the roof of the northern building in the rear. The wall would not extend above the peak of the roof so would not be seen from the front.
3. Control joints were modified to line up as closely as possible with downspouts and building elements

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

Fences may be helpful for screening transformers, gas meters, and communication equipment.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed modifications were appropriate for the site.

Discussion:

The applicant, Greg Cini, 353 S. Parkview Ave., Bexley, Ohio, said the door Mrs. Bitar was speaking about was shifted to the east for safety purposes, and because of that they had to add a sidewalk that extended to the parking lot. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KEMPER HOUSE WORTHINGTON FOR APPROVAL TO MODIFY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 23-18 BY SCREENING

EQUIPMENT AND MAKING OTHER MINOR CHANGES AT 800 PROPRIETORS RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 109-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 109-18, DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2018, 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. Foust, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

6. Sign – 2245 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (Joseph Thurston/NYC Bagel & Sandwich Shop) AR 110-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Final approval was given for Linworth Crossing in 2015, and Sign Criteria were developed and approved in 2016 (see Land Use Plans below). Inclusion of a logo as part of a tenant wall sign requires approval from the ARB.

NYC Bagel & Sandwich Shop is locating in Suite 108, which is in Building A, and would like to install a logo as part of its sign.

Project Details:

1. The proposed sign would have PMS #7621 red lettering consisting of 14” high “NYC BAGEL” above 4” high “& SANDWICH SHOP”.
2. To the left, a 2’ x 2’ bagel logo is proposed in red and black.
3. Total sign area would be about 16 square feet.

Land Use Plans:

Linworth Crossing Development Plan

Approved Sign Criteria per the Development Plan:

- Tenants in a space with a smaller sign band are permitted 28 square feet of sign area.
- Maximum character height is 24”.
- Black gooseneck LED lights will be above all signs.
- All signs will consist of 1 ½” thick non-illuminated dimensional letters and logos, centered in the sign band area. The font style can vary.
- The proposed color palette for the signs is red (PMS #7621); blue (PMS #541); green (PMS #561); and PMS Black C.
- Proposed logos must be approved by the ARB.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the sign met the criteria for this development.

Discussion:

The applicant, Joseph Thurston, 2245 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Mr. Reis said he was glad to see this business moving in. Mr. Thurston said he planned to open very soon. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion application:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JOSEPH THURSTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A WALL SIGN AT 2245 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. , SUITE 108, AS PER CASE NO. AR 110-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 110-18, DATED NOVEMBER 29, 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; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

7. Condensing Unit – **100 W. South St.** (Toepfer) **AR 111-18** (Amendment to AR 11-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This existing split-level house was constructed in 1962 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house sits on a 70.13’ wide lot that is 150’ deep. The owners gained approval on March 22, 2018 to create a house with more living space, and create space that is accessible to allow a parent to move in and the owners to age in place. The project involves partial demolition of the existing house, construction of an addition and garage, and total renovation.

This application is a request for approval to install a condensing unit for the detached garage.

Project Details:

1. The detached garage proposed at the northwest corner of the property is roughly 33’ wide x 22’ deep. The structure was approved to be 3’ from the west property line and 10’ from the rear. Variances were granted for side yard setback and total accessory structure area, which includes a one-car attached garage at the northeast corner of the house.
2. A mini-split air conditioning system is proposed, with the condensing unit placed to the rear of the garage. The proposed unit would be 21” x 30” and 11” deep, and placed 12” from the wall.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Keep functional items such as trash containers and mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as placement of the condensing unit was appropriate to the rear.

Discussion:

The applicant, Neil Toepfer, 100 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, said when he originally applied for approval of the project, the heating and cooling plan was left to be determined. After a lot of discussions with the City's Engineer, and the City's Building Inspector, there is a water line that goes out to the workshop, which is not a living space, but is a working space. Mr. Toepfer decided the space should have heating and cooling and the smallest unit he could find was an 18,000 btu. He said the unit is more than the garage needs but he could not find anything smaller. Mr. Coulter said his neighbor has a unit just like this one, and standing next to the unit, you cannot hear anything. Mr. Toepfer agreed this unit would be extremely quiet. Mr. Coulter said since the unit is in the back of the property and is not visible from the street, screening would not be necessary. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY NEIL TOEPFER TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 11-18 BY ADDING A CONDENSING UNIT FOR THE DETACHED GARAGE AT 100 E. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 111-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 111-18, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 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; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

E. Municipal Planning Commission – New

1. Amendment to Development Plan
 - a. Signage – **160 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (The Heights at Worthington Place) **ADP 09-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This building was approved and constructed between 2012 and 2015. The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center occupies the office space in the building, and has wall signs on both sides of the building, a section of the freestanding sign, and a directional sign on Corporate Hill Dr.

The remainder of the building is devoted to the Heights at Worthington Place apartments. There are existing wall signs on the building that are painted on the northeast and southwest areas of the building, and the apartments are advertised on the freestanding sign. Several years ago temporary banners were installed on the front of the building, but did not gain approval to become permanent.

The applicant is now requesting additional signage to raise awareness for the apartments.

Project Details:

1. Approval to install a 27' high x 4' wide vertically oriented aluminum cabinet sign on the southeast side of the building is requested. The cabinet is proposed with a gray background, and routed out lettering and a logo backed with white acrylic that would illuminate. The freestanding sign was approved with the same basic style, but has push through acrylic for the lettering and logo that stands out from the background. The sign would be on the brick portion of the building between windows. Two other versions of the sign are included in the packet, both of which are smaller. Option #2 shows a white cabinet and option #3 would have a gray cabinet.
2. Three 30" high x 24" wide directional signs are proposed to guide to the leasing office for the Heights. One sign is proposed near W. Wilson Bridge Rd. in the right-of-way; a second sign is proposed north of the entrance to the lower level of the garage, with an arrow pointing straight ahead; and the third sign would be at the northeast corner of the building.
3. The following variances would be needed with this proposal:
 - Number of wall signs
 - Total sign area
 - Directional sign area
 - Size and height of directional signs.

Land Use Plans:

Wilson Bridge Corridor - Signs

Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

- 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.
- 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.

Worthington Planning and Zoning Code

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

Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

When an applicant wishes to make modifications following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council.

Staff Recommendations:

- Although the wall sign would require an additional variance for number of signs and an increase to the total sign area, the proposed sign would not be seen at the same time as the other painted wall signs which are on other walls. Cabinet signs are not preferred, but the style would match the freestanding sign style if the graphics were pushed through to create the look of dimension. Option #1 may look better proportionally on the building.
- The directional sign near Wilson Bridge Rd. cannot be allowed because the location would be in the right-of-way.
- The other two directional signs would be appropriately placed, but the size should be reduced to match the Code requirements of no larger than 2' x 2', and ≤3' in height. The variance for directional sign total area is appropriate.

Discussion:

The applicant, Phillip Philippou, 160 W. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said this was his third visit to talk with the Board members about upgrading their signage. He said people have a hard time trying to find where they need to go. The main door in the front leads to the Ohio State medical offices so people have to go through the parking garage to get to the apartments. They also have patients going into the apartment area that actually need to go to the medical offices. Now that construction is finally over he would like to add some wayfinding signage. People do not realize the main entrance for the apartments is in the back and faces the mall. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Philippou what percentage of the apartments were being occupied and Mr. Philippou said over 90% and that was because of rent incentives to help drive traffic. Mr. Foust and Mr. Reis felt the sign by the office entrance should be moved east so as not to block the view of traffic from the north. Mr. Reis thought the right side should be even with the apron. Mr. Philippou agreed to move the west side directional sign to the east. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Philippou if he was willing to have raised letters for the cabinet sign and he said, “Yes.”

Mr. Tom Carter, 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio, asked for some clarification about the sign proposed on Wilson Bridge Rd. that was not allowed. Mrs. Bitar pointed out the Heights was already identified on the freestanding sign.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON SQUARE ACQUISITION, LLC TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY ADDING SIGNS AT 160 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 09-18, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 09-18, DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2018, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE APPLICANT REVIEWING SPECIFIC SIGN DETAILS WITH STAFF.

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. Subdivision

- a. Preliminary and Final Plats – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Worthington Square Venture, LLC) **SUB 03-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The owner of the Shops at Worthington Place property is requesting approval to subdivide the 16.2 acre mall parcel to create a separate lot for the former Telhio Credit Union, which was on this agenda with an application to house a Bank of America ATM. This property is in the C-2, Community Shopping Center Zoning District. Preliminary and Final Plats are being considered at the same time.

Project Details:

- 1. Following are dimensional requirements for C-2, and proposed dimensions for the proposed lot:

	Minimum Lot Width (in feet)	Minimum Lot Area	Front Yard	Rear Yard	Minimum Width Each Side Yard (in feet)	Maximum Percent of Lot Coverage	Maximum Height of Building Stories	Feet
C-2 Requirements	150	1 Acre	50	30	20	25	3	45
Proposed Lot (4A)	133.29	0.535	~70'	~18'	~33' & ~43'	11.2	1	?

Variations would be needed for lot width and area; rear setback; and possibly lot coverage.

2. The Preliminary Plat shows the location of the reciprocal easement area to allow parking and ingress/egress for the new parcel. The easement would need to be recorded.
3. Note "B" on the final plat is required, and would disallow access to this parcel directly from W. Wilson Bridge Rd.
4. The Final Plat would need approval from the Franklin County and City of Worthington engineering offices.

Land Use Plans:

1141.04 COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.

(b) "C-2" Community Commercial: Commercial centers of an integrated design which contain a concentration of a wide variety of retail and service establishments which are currently located in the community or within the population they serve, having adequate parking and direct access to major thoroughfares, with limited points of access, being screened or fenced from surrounding residential areas, and serving the day-to-day needs of the community supplying the more durable and permanent needs of the whole community. Community commercial uses include, but need not be limited to: supermarkets, department stores, specialty stores, hardware stores, apparel and shoe stores, jewelry stores, appliance and furniture stores, drugstores, personal and business service outlets and discount markets. Community water and sewerage facilities are required.

1149.02 YARD, AREA AND HEIGHT FOR ALL BUILDINGS OTHER THAN DWELLINGS.

The following table establishes the yard, area, lot coverage and maximum height requirements for all buildings except dwellings and structures accessory to dwellings.

	Minimum Lot Width (in feet)	Minimum Lot Area	Front Yard	Rear Yard	Minimum Width Each Side Yard (in feet)	Maximum Percent of Lot Coverage	Maximum Height of Building Stories	Feet
C-2 Requirements	150	1 Acre	50	30	20	25	3	45

Staff Analysis:

Because the proposed parcel does not meet all dimensional requirements, the only reason to approve the subdivision is for economic benefit to the property owner, allowing for the future sale of the property.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar mentioned a specific access and parking agreement is still needed. The applicant, Tom Carter, 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio, said the parcel is land locked, and over the years, he has had several inquiries to buy this lot. He said he would love to see Bank of America have a full building in that location, but most tenants want to own their own parcel. Telhio wanted to own their building, and that was one of the reasons they moved. Mr. Carter said the piece would be more marketable if it was subdivided, and they could attract a long term tenant if they are able to sell the property. Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with this because it would not change the character of how the property is being used or how the property has been used in the past. Mr. Foust asked if there would be any problems with the creation of a substandard lot. Mr. Brown discussed access points and cross access parking agreements. Mr. Carter said he wanted to address Mr. Foust's comments and explained the parcel does self-park even though there are reciprocal

parking and easement agreements. The parcel has 21 parking spaces. Mrs. Bitar explained the Board will also need to decide whether or not the parcel will still be in the Architectural Review District. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON SQUARE VENTURE, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS FOR 7227 N. HIGH ST. TO DIVIDE OFF THE PROPERTY AT 54 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 03-18, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 03-18, DATED NOVEMBER 28, 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 AND THAT THE PROPERTY WILL REMAIN WITHIN THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW DISTRICT.

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.

F. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

G. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.