

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

March 22, 2012

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Chris Hermann, Mikel Coulter and Jo Rodgers. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Richard Hunter, Chair and Amy Lloyd were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of March 8, 2012.

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said “aye” to approve the minutes.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Wall Sign, Awning and ATM with Sign – **6851 N. High St.** (Sign Vision Company/Huntington National Bank) **AR 15-12**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mrs. Bitar said illuminated awnings have not been approved in the district in the past and the welcome sign on the ATM and additional wall sign will need variances. She also noted the applicant had agreed at the last hearing to change the color of the bollards to white. Mrs. Rodgers asked Mrs. Bitar if she had a copy of the previous ATM cover that was approved. Mrs. Bitar said yes, and shared the photo with the Board members.

Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Darrin Gray of Sign Vision approached the microphone and stated his address is 987 Claycraft Rd., Gahanna, Ohio.

Mr. Coulter said he is okay with the welcome sign, but he did not see a real need for an illuminated awning since the bank is not open at night, and felt the additional Huntington sign was not necessary.

Mr. Hermann agreed with Mr. Coulter and said he is comfortable with the welcome sign, but did not believe an internally illuminated canopy was necessary.

Mr. Sauer agreed a canopy was not necessary. He also mentioned the door the bank is installing is glass with glass sides.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the canopy could be a different color such as gray and Mr. Gray said yes, that would be fine.

Mr. Coulter said a down light might be okay, but he did not want to see light shining through the canopy. He also felt the logo on the sign was okay, but did not see the need to have the word "Huntington" on the sign twice and felt the first one should be removed. Mr. Hermann suggested a smaller version near the door. Mrs. Bitar asked if the sign would be a panel with raised letters or box style. Mr. Coulter said a panel.

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

Findings of fact:

1. The freestanding, wall and directional signs for this Huntington bank branch were approved in February to be replaced. The new ATM cover was not previously approved, so is now part of this application. Also, a new awning and additional wall sign are proposed.
2. The ATM cover, which is already in place, is primarily lime green with dark gray at the top and bottom. The cover includes the word "Welcome" and a honeycomb pattern in white. A variance is required for an additional wall sign.
3. Also, a non-illuminated flat panel sign is proposed near the new entry door on the southeast face of the building. The proposed sign will either be a small sign next to the door which has the lime green logo with "Huntington" in white, and has a gray strip at the bottom identifying Huntington Wealth Advisor, or a larger sign between the windows with "Huntington" used only once. A variance is required for an additional wall sign.
4. A down lit gray awning is proposed above the new entry door.
5. All of the bollards will be painted white per a previous approval.

Conclusions:

1. The ATM cover is acceptable.

2. A non-illuminated sign identifying the wealth advisors entrance is appropriate.
3. Down-lighting beneath a gray awning is appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGN VISION COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A SIGN AND AWNING, AND RETAIN AN ATM COVER AT 6851 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-12, DATED MARCH 9, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- Canopy may be gray and down lit only
- Wall sign shall be non-illuminated, and either between the windows in the size shown with “Huntington” shown once, or a smaller version of the proposed may be placed next to the door

Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Sauer said it has been approved.

- b. Roof, Front Porch Alterations, Front Door and Paint – **764 Morning St.** (Scarborough LLC)
AR 16-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, saying the roof was already replaced and is a color similar to the existing. Mrs. Bitar passed a color sample of the proposed paint to the Board members. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present.

Ms. Judy Hauser approached the microphone and stated her address is 3713 Longwood Ct., Cleveland Heights, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked what style the replacement poles would be and she replied the poles would be square and 6” x 6”. Mrs. Bitar asked if the poles are going to be white and she said yes. Mr. Sauer asked if the trim would also be white and she said yes, and the floor will be gray. Mr. Myers asked if she would be keeping the Weeping Cherry tree and she said yes. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. This house has recently been purchased by the applicant, who has already been cleaning the property inside and out, and had the roof replaced before the ARB hearing due to leaking. The new roof consists of dimensional shingles which are weathered wood in color.

2. In addition to the new roof, a new front door is proposed. The door material is not identified, but the look will be a wood-grain 6 panel door.
3. The front porch has a concrete base and metal supports for the roof. A wood floor and 6” x 6” wood posts are proposed.
4. Gray paint with white trim is proposed for the house, which is currently yellow and brown.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed changes will enhance the appearance of the house.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SCARBOROUGH LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF AND FRONT DOOR, ALTER THE FRONT PORCH, AND PAINT THE HOUSE AT 764 MORNING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-12, DATED MARCH 12, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Sauer said it has been approved.

c. Replace Front Porch – **307 E. Granville Rd.** (Paul Norman/Roehrer) **AR 17-12**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, showing pictures of the existing and proposed porches. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Paul Norman approached the microphone and stated his address is 142 E. Stanton, Worthington, Ohio. A brief discussion regarding proposed colors followed.

Findings of fact:

1. Composite material is proposed to replace the existing front porch floor and railing.
2. The porch will be white and gray.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed replacement is an improvement.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PAUL NORMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE FRONT PORCH AT 307 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-12, DATED MARCH 13, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Sauer said it has been approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Additional Multi-Family Building – 835 Proprietors Rd. (Simsbury Investments) ADP 01-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, and said it may not be a good idea to place a gazebo so close to single-family housing. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Carter Bean approached the microphone and stated his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if the new building is slightly taller and Mr. Bean said yes, to allow for 1' higher ceilings for each floor in the new building. Mr. Bean said the original building footprint is approximately 42,000 square feet, and the new building will be 27,327 square feet, but have the same number of units, but without the underground parking. The windows will be the same size and the balconies will have the same recess. Mr. Coulter asked what type of siding will be used and Mr. Bean said they will be using Hardieplank like the first building. Mr. Coulter asked if they have the appropriate number of parking spaces available, and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Bean said they have planned for two parking spaces for each unit. Mr. Sauer asked if were possible to pull the parking back a bit from the sidewalk and Mr. Bean said no, because then it would be too close to the residents to the west. Mr. Coulter felt it would be better to have the parking closer to the street than parking closer to the residents' windows.

Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Bean would have the meters painted to match the building and he said that would be fine. Mr. Myers said it is important to have both signs match up. Mrs. Holcombe said she would like to see a little more focus on the landscaping. Mr. Bean said they planned to plant Honey Locust trees, along with other shrubs and plant materials. Mrs. Rodgers said Honey Locust trees are the worst trees to plant. She said they are not pretty trees and when they get big their branches break easily and are messy to clean up after storms. Mr. Bean asked for a suggestion of what other types of trees would be acceptable. Mrs. Bitar said they could discuss trees later on. Mrs. Holcombe felt the gazebo was unnecessary and more focus could be put on landscaping details. Mr. Coulter suggested a four foot high fence along the entire length of the property.

Mr. Myers asked if the project would be done, or was still pending based on finances. Mr. Bean said it will depend on the construction estimate.

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

Findings of fact:

1. Background:

After demolition of existing Worthington Foods offices, combination of lots into a single parcel, and rezoning to multi-family residential, a Development Plan was approved for this site in 2005. The plan included 2 three-story buildings with parking on the first floor that were to be mirror images of each other. Each building was to have a footprint of roughly 13,600 square foot (sf), and have 16 units ranging in size from 950 – 1530 sf. After approval, the southern building was constructed as proposed, with the intent of selling the units as condominiums. A downturn in the market left the building vacant for several years, until the current owner purchased the property at the end of 2010, and finished and rented the units. Although Franklin County shows the property as two taxing parcels, separation of parcels was never approved by the City, so this is still considered one development. The owners are aware and willing to combine the parcels.

2. Request:

The property owner would like to construct a second building with the same number of units as were originally proposed, but a smaller footprint (9576 sf) and surface parking rather than covered parking on the first level. The proposed 16 units will range in size from 993 – 1347 sf. When the development was originally approved, a variance was granted to allow 32 units on the site. Also, a variance was granted for exceeding the maximum percentage of lot coverage by buildings, so a smaller footprint would lessen that variance.

3. Building:

The building has been designed to be complimentary to the existing, using the same materials and basic design features. Whereas, the existing building is constructed primarily of brick with limited use of Hardieplank lap siding, the proposed will include a more prominent use of the siding. Brick detailing, roof shingles, trim, colors, windows, doors, railings and ridge vents are proposed in the same style as those on the existing building. The ridge of the hipped roof on the proposed building is about 3' higher than the existing building, but the roof height still falls within the maximum height allowed by Code. In addition to four living units, a lobby, storage units and dumpster room are proposed for the first floor. Six units each are proposed for the second and third floors.

4. Parking:

In addition to parking between the buildings, twenty-four head-in parking spaces are proposed at the north end of the property. Variances are required for placement of the parking lot in the front yard setback and not having the required distance between drive entrances. Five trees are proposed for islands in and around the asphalt parking area, but an additional tree may be needed to meet the Code requirement when considering the existing parking on the site. The parking lot will be illuminated with landscape lighting.

5. Landscaping /Site Plan:

A 4' high board on board fence and Norway and Colorado Blue Spruce trees are proposed along the west edge of the property as a buffer for the residential properties behind. Landscaping around the rest of the site is similar to what was approved previously, including decorative fencing approved for placement in the front yard setback. An entry sign to match the existing is proposed at the entrance to the new parking lot. Two signs were previously approved for the site, so this sign would be the second rather than being at the drive between the buildings. A gazebo between the buildings, approved for placement in the rear yard setback, is no longer proposed. Condensing units will be placed similarly to the existing building, in the front, and on the north side of the building. For the first building, a variance was granted for the units to be in the front yard setback.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed amendment will not substantially change the character of the development.
2. The proposed variances are not substantial.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIMSBURY INVESTMENTS TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 835 PROPRIETORS RD. BY ALTERING THE BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN AS PER CASE NO. ADP 01-12, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 01-12, DATED MARCH 9, 2012, 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 FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- Add a fence to match the existing fence along the west property line and repair or replace existing fence; landscaping to match also
- In lieu of building lights use bollard style 36" – 42" landscape lights to illuminate parking lot
- Delete spaces marked #11 & #12 and add landscaping between parking spaces and Proprietors Rd.

- Add two parking spaces in middle lot in place of tree – move tree to south closer to west property line and change species
- Meters and other objects attached to building and roof to be painted to match building
- Condensing units to be shielded by landscaping to extent possible
- Hedgerow and brick piers at north parking lot to emulate south lot treatment
- Narrow existing parking lot drive aisle and move building south to accommodate condensing units on north of new building
- Replace previously approved gazebo with additional landscaping
- Wall light fixtures will match those on the existing building
- Changes to go to Council after staff review.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. Mr. Sauer said it has been approved.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members said “aye”. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.