



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
June 13, 2019

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; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Richard Schuster; and Amy Lloyd. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative; and Lee Brown, Director of Planning and Building. Commission members Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; and Edwin Hofmann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the May 30, 2019 meeting

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

4. Affirmation of witnesses

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished

Mr. Foust moved to remove the following items from the table, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the items were removed from the table.

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Parking Lot Changes – **535 Lakeview Plaza Blvd.** (Chris Blue/Play:CBUS) **ADP 03-19**

2. Conditional Use

- a. Recreational Facility and Restaurant in the I-1 Zoning District – **535 Lakeview Plaza Blvd.** (Chris Blue/Play:CBUS) **CU 04-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Lakeview Plaza was platted in 1985 and development as a light industrial/warehouse and office development. The property in question was constructed in 1995 and consisted of 60,000 sq. ft. of office and warehouse. An additional 26,128 sq. ft. was added to the south end of the building in 2007. The building has evolved over time from storage/warehouse needs to recreational. In 2002 Ohio Sports Plus had a Conditional Use to utilize approximately 35,000 sq. ft. of the southern end of the original building. Super Games was approved by a Conditional Use in 2003 to operate as an adventure education/sports facility in the northern 25,000± sq. ft. of the building. Road Runner Sports took over occupancy of the Ohio Sports Plus space in 2007 and expanded the warehouse to the south by 26,128 sq. ft. and added retail store to the site by a Conditional Use approved in 2007. In 2016 Super Games was approved for additional outdoor storage of trucks and trailers on the north side of the building. Road Runner Sports vacated the site in 2018 however they continue to have a small 7,890 sq. ft. retail facility still at the site.

The applicant is Play:CBUS, out of Cleveland, Ohio. The applicant would like to utilize 52,260± sq. ft. for an indoor adventure park with an associated restaurant and bar for its patrons. It would feature a mix of challenging, fun and entertaining attractions guaranteed to keep you moving all year round, no matter the weather. The applicant has an existing 25,000 sq. ft. facility in Avon, Ohio called Play:CLE, this would be their second location.

Project Details:

1. The existing facility would be remodeled on the inside to have a check-in area, rope course, virtual reality climbing, climbing, kids' area, parkour area, activity area, conference rooms, dining, kitchen and bar area. See attached floorplan.
2. The main entrance to the facility will move to the southern side of the building facing I-270. The applicant will be removing an existing landscape island with a tree at this location. They will be adding two additional trees at the southwest and southeast corners of the building.
3. Signage has not been proposed at this time. Signage will be reviewed by staff in the future for compliance with regulations.
4. Hours of Operation:
 - a. Monday - Typically closed for cleaning, maintenance and occasional private events.
 - b. Tuesday – Thursday – 3:00 PM – 9:00 PM – (School Months) and 10:00 AM – 11:00 PM (Summer Months)
 - c. Friday – 3:00 PM – 11:00 PM – (School Months) and 10:00 AM – 11:00 PM (Summer Months)
 - d. Saturday – 10:00 AM – 11:00 PM
 - e. Sunday – 11:00 AM – 10:00 PM
5. Employees:
 - a. Approximately 15 to 20 employees
6. Anticipating approximately 110,000 – 115,000 guest per year with guests coming from around Columbus and beyond.
7. An average day would consist of approximately 373 guests per day.

8. The average guest tends to visit for 2-3 hours with an average of 2.5 guests per vehicle.
9. Impact on traffic if the number of vehicles driving to/from this location is anticipated to be 50-100 every 2-3 hours.
10. Parking:
 - a. Current Parking:
 - i. 111-parking spaces today
 - ii. Super Games – Northside of building has approximately 18-spaces used for truck and trailer parking associated with their use, this is not included in the 111. They also have a loading dock with three bays. This area is also used for truck and trailer parking.
 - b. Proposed Parking:
 - i. The applicant states that they will be creating 31 additional parking spaces on the site, while removing 2 existing spaces. Total of 31 new spaces being added
 - ii. The existing sloped dock area on the west side of the building will be restriped to for additional parking.
 - iii. Total parking 142 parking spaces and 32-spaces for truck and trailer parking.
 1. Super Games utilizes 22-spaces of the 32-spaces for their truck and trailer use.
 2. At times Super Games utilizes an additional 10-spaces for truck and trailer use in the northwest corner of the site.
 - iv. The Planning & Zoning Code requires 348 parking spaces, a Variance has been requested that will need to be approved by City Council as part of their Amendment to Development Plan.
 1. Super Games – Required 169 spaces by Code, however as part of their approved Conditional Use in 2003 they were approved to have a minimum of 86 spaces. This did not include the 18-spaces that were added in 2016 for outdoor storage.
 2. Road Runner Sports – Retail requires 53 spaces by Code, however that is an extremely large number for this use.
 3. Play:CBUS stated that they need 50-60 for guests plus 15-20 for staff for a total of 65-80 parking spaces for the majority of the year however there are peak times of the year that they anticipate 90-110 spaces for guests and 20-25 for staff.
 4. Play:CBUS parking needs range on the low end 65-80 to on the high end of 110-135 spaces.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan recognizes the industrial corridor as a strong source of revenue for the City. It has functioned as a successful industrial area for decades but faces heavy competition from newer industrial parks in the region and world. As a result, the corridor has declined somewhat since its peak, and experienced conversion from manufacturing and research to warehousing. The corridor consists of a number of buildings of various sizes and arrangements, as well as a few vacant lots. Because of the general age of the corridor and larger size of competing

areas, Worthington's industrial corridor is attractive to small and medium-sized manufacturers and distributors as well as business startups.

The corridor still has the advantages of access to the rail line, proximity to the freeway system, close labor pool, and a location within the outer belt. To remain attractive as an industrial location it is critical to consistently maintain and improve the infrastructure to allow good roadway access for trucking between these industrial sites and the I-270 and I-71 corridors. Because of the attractiveness of the I-270 business office corridor, there is increasing interest in reusing and redeveloping some of this space for office purposes. The City could continue to maintain the corridor as a light industrial/warehousing area, it could work to redirect it as a research and design corridor, or it could allow portions of it to convert to office uses. There are challenges with each approach. The concern is that warehousing uses provide less taxable income to the City than business or research and development facilities because the buildings are housing more inventory than employees. In any case, it is critical that the City protect this area as an employment center. The City should strive to make this area attractive to investment and redevelopment.

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.

Conditional Use Permit 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 – Potential for conflict if parking is not addressed.
2. Effect on public facilities – N/A
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – N/A
4. Utilities required – N/A
5. Safety and health considerations – N/A
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – N/A
7. Hours of use – See above
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Adding additional trees in the parking area.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Little to no change.

Worthington Development Plan Regulations

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts.

The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion

will not likely be created by the proposed development; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

- (c) Design Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to office, research and restricted industrial developments in "C-3" and "I-1" Districts.
- (1) Building heights. No building shall exceed three stories or forty-five feet in height, except as modified by Section 1149.04.
 - (2) Yards. No building shall be less than thirty feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the office, research or industrial development is located. Loading, parking and storage shall be permanently screened from all adjoining properties located in any "R" District by building walls, or a solid wall or compact evergreen hedge at least six feet in height. All intervening spaces between the street pavement and the right-of-way line and intervening spaces between buildings, drives, parking areas and improved areas shall be landscaped with trees and plantings and properly maintained at all times.
 - (3) Tract coverage. The ground area occupied by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) of the total area of the lot or tract.
 - (4) Parking space. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, there shall be provided at least one off-street space for each employee of the maximum working shift. Parking areas will not be located closer than twenty-five feet to any adjoining lot line in any "R" or "C" District and shall be set back at least thirty feet from the street right-of-way line. The parking area shall be graded for proper drainage and improved so as to provide a durable and dust-free surface.
 - (5) Access drives and illumination of parking areas. Access drives shall be at a minimum interval of 300 feet, and illumination of parking areas shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises in any "R" District.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

Staff Analysis:

The main concern related to the proposed use is related to traffic and parking on the site.

1. Parking Issue:

- a. There seems to be a pinch point related to parking on Friday – Sunday between Super Games and Play:CBUS. This does not even factor in the parking needed for Road Runner Sports for their retail store.
- b. Using just the stated parking minimums (169 spaces) for both uses we exceed the parking capacity of the site. There are 142 total parking space available for parking. The remaining spaces are associated with truck and trailer storage.

2. Super Games Approved Conditional Use:

- a. Hours:

- i. Monday – Friday – 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM
 - ii. Saturday & Sunday – 10:00 PM – 8:00 PM
 - b. Employees:
 - iii. 14-full time employees
 - iv. 30-40 part time employees – Weekends only
 - c. Customers:
 - v. Friday – Sunday – 60-75 vehicles parking, does not include those being dropped off and picked up at various times throughout the day.
 - vi. Stated parking needs range from 104-129.
 - d. Required to have 86 parking spaces as part of their approved Conditional Use on September 11, 2003. This did not include the 18-spaces for outdoor storage on the north side of the building.
- 3. Variance:
 - a. A variance from Section 1171.01(b) for parking is needed and will be required to be approved by City Council. Recreational or amusement establishments require 1 space per 150 space feet of gross floor area. According to Code, they would need to have 348 parking spaces. The total parking required on the site if you were to go by City Code would be 570 parking spaces for all the uses. This requirement would be considered extremely obsessive however a reasonable amount of parking should be addressed.
- 4. Parking Options:
 - a. City Staff (Planning & Building, City Manager, City Engineer, Police & Fire) have had internal discussions on whether to permit on street parking along the north and south side of Lakeview Plaza Blvd. with the condition that it be signed, striped and sidewalks installed on the north and south side. **Please see attached.**
 - a. There appears to be enough room for an additional 40-50 cars if we utilize on street parking. There is 80' of right-of-way with approximately 20' in width of paved surface in both directions with a 16' boulevard down the middle. The boulevard has existing trees throughout this stretch of Lakeview Plaza Blvd. that hang over the roadway.
 - b. **There is approximately 1,100 linear feet of sidewalk that would need to be installed. The cost ranges from \$10-\$12 a square foot for concrete, so a 5' wide sidewalk would cost approximately \$55,000.00 to \$66,000.00.**
 - i. **The applicant has stated that if required by Council that they would pay \$60,000.00 towards sidewalks.**
 - ~~c. The Fire Department has expressed concerns over their ability to get emergency equipment through the area related to the tree canopy hanging over the roadway if we permit parking. There is also the concern over the width of the roadway to permit on street parking and still have enough width to get their equipment through the area.~~
 - d. **Since the previous staff memo, the Fire Department was able to take their emergency equipment out to Lakeview Plaza Blvd. and did not see an issue with their ability to navigate the roadway with cars parked along the outer edge and their interaction with the tree canopy of the trees located in the center boulevard.**

- e. Lakeview Plaza Blvd. would provide additional overflow parking if needed on heavy peak days.
- f. These improvements would be at the applicant's expense.
- ~~b. Possibly use the 10 spaces at the northwest corner of the site for parking instead of truck and trailer parking.~~
- c. Possible scenario where Play:CBUS could require their employees (15-25 employees) to park out on Lakeview Plaza Blvd. as a means to provide additional onsite parking for customers.**
 - a. This scenario is hard to regulate and enforce, however it would be a direct benefit to the applicant's customers.**
- d. City Staff has also suggested that the applicant work with the surrounding property owner to the north to secure a parking agreement for overflow parking as part of any approval.
 - a. City staff does not wish to be the mediator in the future between parking constraints between two uses on the site.
 - b. The applicant and City staff had numerous conversations with the property management company to the north and they were unfriendly and unwilling to permit any overflow parking on their site and have stated that they will install signage to have vehicles towed if anyone parks on their property and asked to not be bothered again concerning this matter.**
- e. **There is a possibility that Super Games might be relocating to another property in Worthington. If this use vacates the northern portion of the building, this would open up the site for more parking related to Play:CBUS's use, however the timing of this news may or may not help with the timing of this application.**
 - a. One possibility would be if Super Games were to relocate within 90-days of City Council approval, that the suggested parking for staff and employees and the installation of sidewalks on Lakeview Plaza Blvd. would not be needed.**
 - b. 90-days would possibly give the applicant time to start their interior work that would be needed for the use and give Super Games time to relocate. If for some reason Super Games does not relocate, we would then have the ability to require to offsite improvements prior to City Staff being able to approve their Certificate of Compliance.**

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of both the applications with the following conditions:

- City Council would need to approve the Amendment to Development Plan with a Variance for parking, which in turn would validate the Conditional Use.
 - The Amendment to Development Plan and Conditional Use are truly tied together.
- Play:CBUS staff and employees would need to park out on Lakeview Plaza Blvd. as a means to provide additional onsite parking for customers.
- Sidewalks would need to be installed along Lakeview Plaza Blvd.
- If Super Games decides to relocate within 90-days of City Council approval, the following Conditions would then apply to the Amendment to Development Plan and Conditional Use:

- A minimum of 80 onsite parking spaces for the proposed use.
- Sidewalks would not be required to be installed on Lakeview Plaza Blvd.
- Play:CBUS staff and employees would not be required to park out on Lakeview Plaza Blvd.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Blue, the architect for the project, 28045 Clemens Rd., Suite D, Westlake, Ohio 44145; and Mr. Greg Carlin, 21109 Avalon Dr., Rocky River, Ohio, representing Cbus. Mr. Foust said he wanted to make sure the building's owner was up to speed on what might happen. If Super Games moved out, he did not want the owner to come back to the Board and tell them they created a parking nightmare. Mr. Foust asked City staff if the owner was on board with what was going on. Mr. Brown replied that the owner was copied on all of the outgoing staff memos and have signed off on the application allowing the project to move forward. Mr. Hofmann asked if the parking problem would pop up again if Super Games moved out and a new tenant moved in. Mr. Brown said yes, the situation could pop up again, but they would have to take a look at the situation when that happens. Mr. Hofmann asked if for some reason Super Games did not move would there be sidewalks added and parking along the roadway and Mr. Brown said yes. Mr. Brown said it would be up to City Council to approve the variances for parking which would include a protective mechanism.

Conditional Use Permit Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHRIS BLUE ON BEHALF OF PLAY:CBUS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RECREATIONAL FACILITY AND RESTAURANT AT 535 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 04-19, DRAWINGS NO. CU 04-19, DATED APRIL 26, 2019, 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 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: CITY COUNCIL WOULD NEED TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH A VARIANCE FOR PARKING, PLAY:CBUS STAFF AND EMPLOYEES WOULD NEED TO PARK ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., SIDEWALKS WOULD NEED TO BE INSTALLED ALONG LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AND IF SUPER GAMES DECIDES TO RELOCATE WITHIN 90-DAYS OF CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL, THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS WOULD THEN APPLY TO THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE: A MINIMUM OF 80 ONSITE PARKING SPACES FOR THE PROPOSED USE, SIDEWALKS WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO BE INSTALLED ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD. AND

PLAY:CBUS STAFF AND EMPLOYEES WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PARK ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD.

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

Amendment to Development Plan Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHRIS BLUE ON BEHALF OF PLAY:CBUS TO AMEND ADP 03-19 BY ADDING AND RECONFIGURING PARKING LAYOUT THAT WILL RESULT IN A VARIANCE FROM THE NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPOTS FOR THE PROPOSED USE AT 535 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 03-19, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 03-19, DATED APRIL 26, 2019, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL 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 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: CITY COUNCIL WOULD NEED TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH A VARIANCE FOR PARKING, PLAY:CBUS STAFF AND EMPLOYEES WOULD NEED TO PARK ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., SIDEWALKS WOULD NEED TO BE INSTALLED ALONG LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AND IF SUPER GAMES DECIDES TO RELOCATE WITHIN 90-DAYS OF CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL, THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS WOULD APPLY TO THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE: A MINIMUM OF 80 ONSITE PARKING SPACES FOR THE PROPOSED USE, SIDEWALKS WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO BE INSTALLED ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD. AND PLAY:CBUS STAFF AND EMPLOYEES WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PARK ON LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD.

Mr. Foust seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Architecture Review Board

2. Building C & Ice House Demolition – **445 E. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Boundless Behavioral Health) **AR 43-19 & AR 44-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Harding Hospital was founded in 1916 by George T. Harding II, MD as the Columbus Rural Rest Home. The hospital provided treatment for people with physical, mental, social and spiritual needs on the 45 acre Worthington campus until 1999, when it became part of The Ohio State University's Wexner Medical Center. In 2014, Step by Step academy purchased the property and has been

providing mental health services out of some of the buildings on the property. Many of the buildings have not been used or maintained in decades. In 2017 the Board approved the demolition of buildings D, E & F on the site.

This applicant is requesting to demolish building C and the Ice House at this time. Pictures of the buildings with brief descriptions are included with the application.

Project Details:

1. The two buildings in question are on the northwest part of the campus, with building C being adjacent to Rush Creek.
2. The applicant reports the buildings have not been maintained in decades and are in complete disrepair.
3. The structure known as the Ice House is currently surrounded by a chain-link fence to keep people away from and out of the structure. The roof and siding are in complete disrepair and are reasonably beyond being salvaged. The applicant states that the structure is an eyesore and a safety hazard. Please see attached pictures.
 - a. Once demolished, the applicant has proposed to fill, grade and reseed the site.
4. Building C has been abandoned for many years. The structure was originally designed to be a house; however, the interior was reconfigured at some point in time to be used as office space.
 - a. Reconfiguration of the interior for current programmatic and accessibility needs would be nearly impossible and cost prohibitive.
 - b. Structural issues are apparent, and mold is found throughout the building. The exterior of the building is also in poor repair from decades of neglect. The exterior metal fire escape has rusted away, and the foundation has been found to be crumbling. Existing HVAC equipment and ductwork have been removed or vandalized. Waterline and gas lines have corroded or removed. Please see attached pictures.
 - c. The building poses a safety hazard and has been broken into many times over the years.
 - d. Once demolished, the applicant has proposed to fill, grade and reseed the entire site.
5. Both the Divisions of Police and Fire are aware of the buildings and feel they are a hazard. Both Divisions have been in the buildings and reports interior collapses, exposure to the elements and vandalism as contributing to the damage. Both support demolition of the structures, as is state in memos attached to the application.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

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

- Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a

newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.

- For projects in which demolition of an older structure is proposed, the applicant should contact the City of Worthington as early as possible. The city may be able to help with evaluating alternatives to demolition. In all cases where demolition is proposed, applicants should be prepared to explain and to document the financial and technical reasons why it is not feasible to accomplish their goals while retaining the existing building.
- It may be acceptable to demolish an older building that has been so altered over the years that its integrity is low and it has lost most or all of its historic character. This does not, however, always apply, since even altered buildings can sometimes be important placeholders along the streetscape. Because of age or design, some building additions may be nearly as important as an original building. Removing these elements might affect the building's character, and this should be taken into account when demolition is proposed.
- Demolition to create parking lots should be avoided, particularly along the dense streetscape of High Street. Loss of buildings here would permanently alter the character of the whole district.
- Demolition to combine lots for larger developments is strongly discouraged. Small-scale buildings on closely-spaced sites characterize much of Worthington's older areas. Assembly of land in these areas for large lots and construction of large buildings, especially involving demolition of existing structures, is not appropriate.
- When full or partial demolition of an existing structure is proposed, the applicant should be prepared to present detailed plans for the replacement building. Demolition may not proceed until it has been determined that the structure conforms to the new construction design guidelines.

Architectural District Ordinance

- Whenever a building within the District is proposed to be demolished, partially demolished or removed, an application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be filed with the City Clerk as provided in this chapter. Such application shall set forth the intent to demolish.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall hear the request not sooner than twelve days nor later than sixty days from the date the application is filed and shall advertise such hearing to provide time for public comment. The Board may request a statement from the City's Division of Building Regulation on the structural condition of the building and the conformity of the building to applicable building codes. In addition, the Board may request at the City's expense a written statement concerning the proposed demolition by a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. Such statement shall be taken into consideration in determining the appropriateness of the request. The applicant may provide at his or her expense any evidence or testimony from a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. The Board of Architectural Review shall act on the request not later than thirty days after the initial hearing on the application. The applicant may waive this requirement by filing with the Director of Planning and Building a written statement waiving the right to have his or her application acted upon within such thirty-day period.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall determine by a vote of its members whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness based on the determination:

- That such building is not historically or architecturally significant;
- That if the building is found to be historically or architecturally significant, there is no feasible or prudent alternative or change that would allow preservation of the building; and
- The proposal for grading, landscaping and other design treatment once the structure is removed meets the standards of this chapter.
- In any circumstance, the Board shall not deny a request for a certificate of appropriateness if it determines either:
 - o That such denial will deny all reasonable use of the property or
 - o That such denial shall result in an unsafe condition because of the structural or physical condition of the building.
- No building shall be demolished or removed in the Architectural Review District without the owner or his or her representative first obtaining a certificate of appropriateness approving such removal or demolition, unless such building presents an immediate danger to public health and safety in the opinion of the City's Chief Building Official, in which event, the Chief Building Inspector may order removal or demolition of such building in order to protect public health and safety.

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Dr. Michael Mayhew, 995 Lori Lane, Westerville, Ohio; and Mrs. Lori Sontag, 6631 Eastland Ct., Worthington, Ohio. Dr. Mayhew distributed some additional photographs to the Board members and City staff and discussed how the historical character of the buildings has slowly been stripped and both are falling apart. He said most people have already seen a copy of their Master Plan to redevelop the site and make the place beautiful again. Mr. Hofmann said this was a case of awful neglect by the previous owner. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Bill Alsauer, 544 White Oak Pl., Worthington, Ohio, said he has no objection to the demolition of the buildings, his property borders the area. He said he has looked at the Master Plan and wanted to go on record stating that he felt the plan would negatively affect his property and the Rush Creek Village drainage issues. Mr. Alsauer said he did not feel the Board needed to act on anything he just wanted to go on record about what his concerns were moving forward. Mr. Coulter suggested to the applicant, as they proceed to move forward with their new plan, to have a presentation for everyone to see.

Mr. Matt Wunderle, 563 White Oak Pl., Worthington, Ohio, said Dr. Mayhew and his organization has been very good with communication and he appreciated that. He wanted to know if any other historical organizations were contacted to see if they wanted the Ice House. Mr. Brown said staff did reach out to the Worthington Historical Society and they are already aware of what has been

going on and have been documenting the history. The Worthington Historical Society did not have any interest in the building.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BOUNDLESS BEHAVIORAL HEALTH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH BUILDING C AND THE ICE HOUSE AT 445 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-19 AND 44-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-19 AND AR 44-19, DATED MAY 8, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

2. Illuminated Wall Sign – 2159 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (Danite Sign/Allstate) AR 51-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This shopping center was originally constructed in the 1950's, with a major addition and renovation completed in the late 1980's. At that time, the storefronts and signs were approved in a uniform manner. Over the years, many amendments have been approved including the addition of a gable at the east end, multiple sign changes and most recently a change to the color scheme. In 2008, the eastern half of the building was approved for a facelift including new fascia and a change to the sign styles. Allstate is proposing to open a new facility and would like to install a new sign at this location.

Project Details:

1. The new sign would be 18" x 7" 0-1/2" x 4" deep white acrylic face lit LED illuminated channel letters and a 2'7" x 3' 3-1/4" x 4" deep white and blue face lit LED-illuminated logo attached to a raceway painted to match the fascia.
2. A blue vinyl logo is proposed to be applied to the window. Clarification is needed to whether this is on the inside or outside of the window.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building.

Staff Analysis:

- Proposed signage is not compliant with what was originally approved by the Board for the shopping center.

- Individually mounted letters mounted to a board is what was approved for the shopping center and is what others in the shopping center have been required to installed.
- Allstate was previously located in this location and their previous signage matched with what was approved by the Board.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended denial of this application, as the proposed signage is inappropriate and inconsistent with the other approved signage located in the shopping center.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jennifer Bender said she was representing Danite Sign Company, 1087 Oak St., Columbus, Ohio 43205. Ms. Bender said she inherited this project because the original applicant unfortunately passed away three weeks earlier. She said she would like to get this project passed as quickly as possible so her All State Agent client has signage. Ms. Bender said her biggest concern was to find something the Board would approve of and bring it back to the next meeting. Mr. Reis said he agreed with staff overview and concerns. He felt the logo was too large and suggested lowering the All State lettering to 15 inches and have the logo made five or six inches smaller that might help the sign look more compatible with the adjacent tenants. Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed; she also felt the scale of the sign was too large. Mr. Coulter said he liked the individual letters because it tied the sign more together with the center. Mr. Hofmann said the thinness of the letters was also important. He said he would prefer to see a dimensional letter that was not lit up. Mr. Reis asked Ms. Bender if her client could agree to lettering that was 15 inches and a logo that was 24 inches. Ms. Bender said she felt that would probably be okay. Ms. Bender said the film on the window would be on the inside. 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 DANITE SIGNS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SIGN FOR ALLSTATE AT 2159 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 51-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 51-19, DATED MAY 10, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THAT THE SIGNAGE SHALL BE CHANGE SO THAT THE LOGO WOULD BE 26” IN HEIGHT, AND THE LETTERS TO BE PROPORTIONAL AT 15” IN HEIGHT;**
- **THAT THE THICKNESS OF THE LETTERS WILL BE 1 1/2.”**
- **THAT THE WINDOW FILM MUST BE ON THE INSIDE**

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

3. Roof Replacement – **58 E. North St.** (Angela & Thomas Strous) **AR 52-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The one-story ranch home was constructed in 1955. A shed was approved by the Board in 2004 to be placed in the northwest corner of the lot. The shed is 12'x16' (192 sq. ft.) with a gambrel roofed that was painted a putty color to match the house. In 2006 the Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals approved the construction of a two-car garage that is 24' x32' (768 sq. ft.) in area on the east side of the property with the condition that the shingles on the roof were to match the brown shingles on the shed. The applicant would like to replace the shingles on the hipped roof of the house to a Slate Gray dimensional shingle.

Project Details:

1. Roofing is proposed to be Slate Gray in color and would be a dimensional shingle.
2. The roof on the detached two-car garage and shed would remain brown.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Roofs, gutters and downspouts are an integrated water removal system that gets rain- and meltwater away from a house as fast as possible. In addition, they are highly visible parts of a building's character.

When installing a new roof on a building that currently has asphalt shingles, avoid the uneven, "staggered-butt" design or other shingle patterns that try to create an older look; a medium gray color generally is appropriate on an older building if it originally had a slate roof. Green, red or black shingles may also be appropriate, depending on the building's predominant colors. Avoid very light-colored shingles.

The Design Guidelines recommend new outbuildings take design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Also, a new building should be compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies. The Guidelines state outbuildings typically are frame buildings, modest in scale and simple in design.

Staff Analysis:

- The proposed color of the dimensional shingles for the house does not complement the existing color of the shingles on the shed and two-car garage.
- All buildings should have a similar color and style of roofing materials.

- The applicant has stated that they do not plan to install new roofing on the shed and garage at this time.
- If the roofing color and style on the house, shed and garage were to match, staff would be able to administratively approve the application.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application, as the style and color did not meet the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Angela Strous, and Mr. Tom Strous, 58 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Strous said she submitted color samples to the Board. She and her husband prefer the gray color for the shingles. She found a different company that could match the garage shingles, but the color would look hideous on the house, so they would like to stay with the gray color they have already picked out. The other two buildings on the property (garage and shed) have roof tops that are in good shape and do not need replaced yet. Mrs. Strous said she already submitted photographs of the damage that occurred to their roof. Mr. Hofmann and Mr. Coulter both agreed the gray would look much better on the house. Mr. Reis suggested matching the garage shingles to the house when it is time to replace the garage shingles and Mrs. Strous said that was her plan. 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 ANGELA AND THOMAS STROUS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW ROOF ON THE HOUSE AT 58 E. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 52-19 DRAWINGS NO. AR 52-19, DATED MAY 22, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

4. Shed, Retaining Walls & Landscaping – **324 E. Granville Rd.** (Aaron & Dina Hunt) **AR 53-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was constructed around 1900 and is two-stories with a clipped gable on the front and a cross gable at the rear. There is a one-story sunroom in the front (southeast corner), and a one-story gabled area extends to the rear. In 2016 the Board approved the lap siding on the house to be replaced as necessary and approved the replacement of most of the existing windows on the

house with the condition that the front window be restored. The new homeowners would like to install a shed at the rear of the site and undertake a major landscape plan for the area around the house with the focus being on the front yard.

Project Details:

1. A new 10'x14' shed is proposed in the far northeast corner of the lot that would have a rear setback of 15' and a side setback of 10' from the property line.
2. The existing lot is 66' wide and 330' deep in size. The lot is twice the size in area of your typical lot found in Old Worthington and it is extremely deep.
3. The proposed shed is a wood-framed structure and a gabled roof. Weather wood asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof, and vertically oriented Duratemp plywood siding is proposed for the walls. The shed would have a 60" barn style double door flanked by two windows with shutters. The shed would be painted ivory with khaki trim to match the house.
4. There is an existing detached 468 sq. ft. two-car garage/barn on the property near the house with an existing metal roof.
5. There is also a proposal to heavily landscape around the perimeter of the house with landscaping and install low retaining walls around the landscaped beds that will be created in front of the home and out towards E. Granville Rd. Please see attached materials.
6. The proposed river birch trees, bluestone walk, brick walk, bluestone patio, irregular bluestone walk and stone firepit are currently not part of this application at this time.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. They can be found in both the oldest and the more newly developed parts of town.

Other landscape elements include lawns, planting areas, gardens, bushes and shrubs. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character.

Staff Analysis:

1. E. Granville Rd. has an existing right-of-way of 60'. The right-of-way actually extends approximately 8.5' behind the sidewalk along E. Granville Rd. in this location.
2. The Service & Engineering Department provided the following comments:
 - a. Move the proposed Korean Spice Viburnums that are to run parallel with the sidewalk back to approximately 8.5' to give the Viburnums a chance to grow

without negatively impacting those walking on the sidewalk out by the street and created a constant trimming nightmare for the property owners.

- i. The applicants stated that they would be willing to move the Viburnums outside of the public right-of-way.
- b. There needs to be an understanding that the area of low plantings that is proposed in area identified as public right-of-way would be the responsibility of that property owner and that if the City needed to do work in the public right-of-way, the property owner would be responsible for the landscaping not the City.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed landscaping, retaining walls and shed were compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Dina Hunt, and Mr. Aaron Hunt, 324 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Reis felt the landscaping project looked nice and would be a benefit to the property and to the adjacent property. 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.

Motion:

Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY AARON AND DINA HUNT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED, RETAINING WALL AND LANDSCAPING AT 324 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 53-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 53-19, DATED MAY 29, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

5. Wall Sign and Projection Sign – **7227 N. High St.** (Lehner Sign/The Exercise Coach) **AR 54-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Exercise Coach occupies the former Swan Cleaners location on the northern end of the Shops at Worthington Place next to FrontRunner. The Exercise Coach is a modern-day exercise facility for men and women. The applicant is requesting a new wall sign and projection sign for the site.

Project Details:

1. The wall sign will consist of individually mounted PVC letters that will be mounted to the wall with 3/16” studs with silicone. The letters will be painted Cool Gray and Orange with 3/4” standoffs to give the sign some dimension. There is also a logo (stopwatch) incorporated in “O” in Coach. There will be small sleeves to over the studs to make the letters stand off from the wall.
2. The projection sign will be 30”x48” blade sign that will hang on a boulevard style bracket attached to the building. This sign will be double sided. The sign appears to be white with the same lettering and colors as the wall sign. Clarification is needed on the material.

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. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Exposed raceways or wiring are not desirable. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

Wall-mounted Signs

- 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.

Staff Analysis:

- The Design Guidelines discourages the use of modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors, however this sign is in an area that is not visible from High St. and W. Wilson Bridge Rd. The projection sign might be visible Old Wilson Bridge Rd. however it is over a 190₊ from the roadway.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed signage seems to be in keeping with the other signage found at the Shops at Worthington Place and with the overall intent of the Design Guidelines and the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Greg Bunger, 375 Sycamore Dr., Circleville, Ohio, said he was representing Lehner Signs. He said the sign would be made out of 13 oz. banner material, the poles will be white but not visible, and the brackets will be aluminum gray. 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.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LEHNER SIGN/THE EXERCISE COACH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL MOUNTED SIGN AND PROJECTION SIGN AT 7227 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 54-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 54-19, DATED MAY 29, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

6. Retaining Wall, Patio, Steps, Firepit and Landscaping – 615 Oxford St. (Lynn Bird) AR 55-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is a single-story stucco ranch constructed in 1935. In 2002 the Board approved the construction of a 230 sq. ft. composite (TimberTech) deck on the rear of the home. The rear yard is heavily landscape and slopes to the west. The applicant would now like undertake a major hardscape and landscape plan for the rear yard that would allow the applicant to better access the rear portion of their property.

Project Details:

1. There is an existing stone retaining wall that was installed by a previous property owner and after decades of functionality it has started to deteriorate and erode over time which has led to the dislodging of boulders and exposing the existing pavers along the walkway and patio area.
2. The existing deck will remain.
3. The proposed wall will be professionally installed and will include boulders and several tiered levels of gardens sloping west. Please see attached landscape plan.
4. The applicant would like to convert an existing area that struggle to grow grass with a paver patio circle with a small firepit that would complement an existing paver patio at the rear of the site. The applicant would be installing fieldstone walkway between the patio areas towards a proposed Rosetta stone cascade stairway that would provide access to the upper patio area at the rear of the house.
5. The existing lot is 68' wide and 132' deep in size. The lot is a smaller sized lot found in Worthington.
6. The applicant has an agreement with the neighbors to the south to provide access to the rear of their yard during construction.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. They can be found in both the oldest and the more newly developed parts of town.

Other landscape elements include lawns, planting areas, gardens, bushes and shrubs. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed landscaping, retaining walls, patio, firepit and landscaping were compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Lynn Bird, 615 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. 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:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LYNN BIRD FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A RETAINING WALL, PATIO, STEPS, FIREPIT AND LANDSCAPING AT 615 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 55-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 55-19, DATED MAY 30, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

7. Sunroom Addition – 707 Morning St. (Gary Alexander/Glenn Laine) AR 56-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The structure is a two and ½ story brick American Foursquare that was constructed in 1913 with hip dormers and existing wood siding. The property owner would like to construct a new octagon shaped sunroom on the south side rear portion of the existing home where there is currently a paver patio.

Project Details:

1. Construction of an approximately 320 sq. ft. sunroom in the location of the existing paver patio.
2. The sunroom will be one-story in height with a hipped roof to match the slope on the existing house.
3. The sunroom addition will be in the current location of the paver patio which sits behind an existing picket fence and landscaping.
 - a. The applicant will be keeping the mature trees at the east and west ends of the patio as part of this project.
4. The addition sits back approximately 70' from Morning Street and over 35' from the southern property line.
5. The existing lot is 120' wide and 252' deep in size. The lot is approximately three times the size in area of your typical lot found in Old Worthington.
6. The proposed sunroom's roof slope, shingles, trims and stair railing is characteristic of the home and are being incorporated in the addition.
7. The addition will be painted to match the existing color scheme found on the main house and will be wood to match.
8. The shingles will be 3-tab shingles to match what is on the main house. There is a small portion of the roof where the new addition meets the existing roofline that is proposed to be a rubber membrane. Clarification needed on color.
9. The trim and soffit will match and align with the main house.
10. Trex decking on treads (gray) and landing, risers (white) painted wood matching the existing front porch.
11. New windows and doors are to be Marvin. The windows will be double hung wood glad windows with simulated divided lites and spacer bars. Profile of muntin to match the existing windows on the house.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Construction of an addition to an existing home involves not only budget considerations and technical issues such as building codes, permits, and zoning; it also involves important design considerations, since an addition can have a significant impact on the original house and on neighboring properties as well. Keep the following considerations in mind when planning an addition.

Use exterior materials traditionally used in Worthington. New materials used on an addition do not necessarily have to match the original materials of an older building -- a frame addition with beveled siding is appropriate for a brick house, for example -- but starkly modern materials such as diagonal rough-cut siding or painted concrete block should be avoided. Stone typically was not used in Worthington for additions, or for houses in general, and should also be avoided.

Be sure the addition is subordinate in appearance to the main building. This does not necessarily mean that the addition must be smaller than the original (though this is preferred), but it should be designed in a way that it does not overwhelm and dominate the original. It should be clear which structure is the original and which is the addition. A successful way to do this is to give the addition a lower height and roofline and smaller windows than the original.

Additions should be located as far as possible to the rear of the original building, and there should be a separation between the two to show that the addition did in fact come later. One approach is to use a small, low-roofed connector between the original building and the addition.

Some differentiation between old and new may be made in details such as window design and trim around openings and at eaves. For example, a simpler version of the trim and details of the original house could be used on an addition as a way of showing that one came later than the other.

Staff Analysis:

1. Exterior lighting.
 - a. The plans do not show any exterior lighting. Clarification needed.
2. Roof:
 - a. Color of the rubber membrane. Clarification needed.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed addition was compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Gary Alexander said he was the architect for the project, 1265 Neil Ave., Columbus, Ohio; and Ms. Garneta Aber, 707 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Alexander said the new rubber roof would be black and there could be new lighting. There are currently two coach style lamps that bracket the front door, so they plan something similar for the back door. There is also a two-headed flood light that illuminates the patio, but that might be moved around to the other side. Mr. Coulter explained if there was not a cut sheet for the lighting to take the lighting plan to City staff for review. 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:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY GARY ALEXANDER/GLENN LAINE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR A SUNROOM ADDITION AT 707 MORNING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 56-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 56-19, DATED MAY 31, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

8. Egress Windows – 120 E. Granville Rd. (Ryan & Katherine Coffman) AR 57-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The structure is a one and ½ story wood bungalow that was constructed in 1920 at the corner of E. Granville Rd. and Morning St. The property shares a driveway and access point with the neighboring property to the west. The Board approved several alterations to this property in 2011 and 2012 related to windows, doors, deck, patio and front porch additions. The property recently transferred, and the new owners would like to install two egress windows to the two basement bedrooms on the west side of the house along the driveway.

Project Details:

1. There are existing glass block in the basement windows. The property owner would like to convert one of the glass block windows to an egress window and install a second egress window along the western side of the house in the location of an existing planter bed along the driveway.
2. The property owners are proposing a vinyl buck and sash slider unit from Monarch that would be 4'x4' in size. Clarification needed on window color.
3. The window well is a prefabricated unit that will be 54" wide and project out from the house 42". This does include a built-in ladder. Clarification needed on color.
4. There is a window well cover that will be installed and hinged to permit ventilation and egress when needed. The proposed cover will also provide additional protection for those walking along the driveway to not walk near the window well. The cover comes in polished aluminum, white and sandalwood. Clarification needed on color.
5. The applicants side property line is 11.62' from the western property line. The window well will be located outside of the required side yard setback, so a variance will not be needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Older residential building foundations in Worthington are made of stone, either rough coursed rubble or quarried and shaped cut stone, which had a more finished look. Newer structures often can have foundations of rock-faced concrete block, brick, or poured concrete. All these materials were designed to carry the weight of the building down into the soil and to spread that weight out so it did not exceed the bearing capacity of the soil.

On some buildings, the foundations rose only slightly above ground level and often were concealed by the building's siding. On others, higher foundations were intended to be part of the building's visual character. Builders set the footings of foundations below the frost line to help ensure that walls would stay plumb and that different parts of a building would not settle at different rates, and so they would not heave and crack in freezing soil.

Avoid cutting openings in foundation walls to create basement windows or doors. If such openings really are necessary, get good advice from an engineer, architect, contractor or mason about how to do this work without weakening the foundation.

New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Staff Analysis:

1. Vinyl windows are not the preferred option however this is a lower level window that will be providing emergency egress to bedrooms located in the basement and will be partially blocked by the existing landscaping along the house and driveway.
2. The Building Code requires egress windows in rooms in a basement if they are to be used as sleeping rooms (bedrooms).
 - a. The egress windows would permit the bedrooms in the basement to meet Code and legally be considered bedrooms.
3. Clarification is needed on the color of the vinyl window, window well and window well cover.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed alterations were generally compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ryan Coffman, 120 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. The window trim will be white, and the pre-fab window well will be sandstone. 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:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RYAN AND KATHERINE COFFMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE INSTALLTION OF EGRESS WINDOWS AT 120 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 57-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 57-19, DATED MAY 31, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

9. Shed Siding – **881 Oxford St.** (Steve Strohl & Kathleen Gwynne) AR 60-19 – Amending AR 29-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The house is a 1950's Cape Cod which is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The structure includes a garage that is attached on the north side, and a deck to the rear that was approved in 2012. On April 11, 2019 the Board approved the construction of a new shed at the rear of the property with the condition of a gabled roof being used instead of a shed roof. The property owners are now requesting to amend their previous request to now have vertical composite siding instead of the previously approved horizontal siding.

The location of the shed would still be in the northwest corner of the property.

Project Details:

1. The footprint of the proposed shed would be 12' x 16', with the actual structure being 12' x 12'. Location would be angled toward the yard from the corner, 8' from the side property line and 10' from the rear property line.
2. A gabled roof is proposed for the structure. The extra 4' of proposed flooring would be covered by a higher ~11'11" part of the roof and function as a deck. The rear of the roof would be ~8'8".
3. Wood composite siding is proposed for the walls that would be painted Sherwin Williams Porpoise (7047) to match the house. Asphalt shingle roofing to match the house is also proposed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, the modification to the siding is not out of character for the district.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Kate Gwynne, 881 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio; and Mr. Steve Strohl, 881 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. 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:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVE STROHL & KATHLEEN GWYNNE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE SIDING ON A SHED AT 881 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 60-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 60-19, DATED MAY 31, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Wilson Bridge Corridor

- a. Side & Front Yard Setback – **181 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Advanced Civil

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

On Monday, May 20, 2019 Tom Warner with Advanced Civil Design and David Hodge, Esq. with Underhill & Hodge LLC representing Granby Place, the new 32-unit apartment complex on East Wilson Bridge Road notified City Staff that the surveying stakes that marked the setbacks were placed in the wrong location on the eastern side of the site for Building #1 (front building).

On October 15, 2018 City Council approved the Final Plan with a Variance to permit the side setback to be at 25.1-feet from the property line, however the front building was constructed at 21.5-feet (fire suppression bump-out) to 23.8-feet (main building) from the eastern side property line. The front setback was shown to be 7-feet from the recently dedicated right-of-way line for E. Wilson Bridge Rd., however the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Zoning permits the setback to be as close as 5-feet for the front setback. The building was placed at 5-feet from the front setback line vs. the 7-feet referenced on the approved plans.

The applicants were informed that they would need to go back to the Municipal Planning Commission to amend the Final Development Plan for the Wilson Bridge Corridor and City Council would need to ultimately approve deviating from 25.1-feet to the 21.5-feet to 23.8-feet for the side yard. The applicants immediately made application on Friday, May 31, 2019 to be on the June 13, 2019 Municipal Planning Commission meeting. City Council will likely hear this item in July 2019.

All work on Building #1 has ceased until this can go before Municipal Planning Commission and City Council for approval.

Original Project Overview:

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-feet from the street, and parallel to the street. The existing right-of-way line is 10.1-feet from the back of curb, and the city is requesting an additional 15-feet of right-of-way for future location of a recreational path. The setback of Building #1 from the new property line would be about 7-feet. Sidewalk and steps are proposed along the front of the building to provide access to the individual units. Building #1 is proposed about 40-feet from the west property line and 25-feet from the east property line. Variances were granted for the building to be closer than 50-feet 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 have been needed.

2. Buildings.

- The buildings have 16-dwelling units each, or 16-units 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 approved by MPC. Both residential buildings are to be 2 stories in height, with all units being a single level. All units have a separate entry door, with 8-units on each side of the buildings.
- Both buildings 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.

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.

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.

Original Variances Approved by City Council:

- Section 903.10 to allow a driveway to exceed forty-five (45) feet in width at the curb line.
 - Approved by City Council, however revised plans were submitted that permitted the driveway to be reduced in width to meet Code requirements.
- Section 1181.05(a)(1)(C) to permit buildings to be closer than fifty (50) feet in “R” districts to the property line.
 - Approved by City Council to permit the front building to be built 25.1-feet from the eastern side property line.
- Section 1181.05(c)(1) requires all healthy trees 6-inch caliper or larger to be retained, or replaced with a total tree trunk diameter to the removed tree, or a fee of \$150.00 per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced.
 - Approved by City Council
- Section 1181.06(a)(3) requires a maximum density of 14-dwelling units/acre.
 - Approved by City Council

Staff Analysis:

- **Section 1181.05(a)(1)(C) to permit buildings to be closer than fifty (50) feet in “R” districts to the property line.**
 - 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.

Development History:

- April 13, 2017 – MPC recommend approval to City Council to rezone the property from the R-10 District to the WBC-1 District.
- May 1, 2017 – City Council approved the rezoning.
- July 3, 2017 – Effective date of the new zoning after the 60-day moratorium period.
- June 14, 2018 – MPC tabled the Preliminary Plan to incorporate recommended changes.
- June 28, 2018 – MPC approved the Preliminary Plan.
- July 26, 2018 – MPC recommend approval of the Final Plan to City Council.
- October 15, 2018 – City Council approved the Final Plan with Variances

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of an Amendment to the Final Plan for the Wilson Bridge Corridor, the proposed amendment met the overall intent of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Zoning and met the planning goals of the City, as referenced in the Land Use Plans.

City Council will need to grant a variance to deviate from their previous approval for the side yard setback.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Katarina Karac stated that she is an attorney for Underhill & Hodge LLC in place of Mr. David Hodge, on behalf of the applicant, Advanced Civil Design. Mr. Tom Warner, also representing Advanced Civil Design. He said they were the first to realize the flaw and raised their hands and admitted making the mistake. Mr. Warner said it was in the best interest for his client to keep things moving, but this was an honest mistake, so they are before the Board to make sure everyone is okay with what happened. Mr. Reis said he has been in this type of situation before, but Mr. Warner would have to go before City Council for final approval. Mr. Warner said he is one of the owners of the business and they have been around for seventeen years in Gahanna. He said they assisted with the development of the Kemper House on Proprietors Road, and the 350 West Wilson Bridge Road building where Wheels Up is located. He said this is the first time they have ran into this type of situation, but they brought it to the city’s attention right away. Mr. Coulter said the adjacent property owner was notified and they have not expressed concerns. The sidewalk would still be in the same position, as previously planned. Only the building moved over to the east 1’4”. Nothing else on the property would be affected. 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 ADVANCED CIVIL DESIGN ON BEHALF OF GRANBY PLACE LLC FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FINAL PLAN FOR GRANBY PLACE AT 181 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AWBC 01-19, DRAWINGS NO. AWBC 01-10, DATED MAY 31, 2019, BE RECOMMENDED TO 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. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

6. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye;" and the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.