

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

April 11, 2013

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: Richard Hunter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice Chair; Mikel Coulter; Amy Lloyd 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. Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; and Chris Hermann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the meeting of March 28, 2013

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Fence – **195 E. Granville Rd.** (Lorraine & David Robinson) **AR 19-13**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. This house sits at the southwest corner of Rt. 161 and Plymouth St. The applicants would like to extend the existing fence enclosing the rear yard to an area on the east side of the property. The east side yard is in the setback and into the right-of-way, and a gravel parking area is in the right-of-way. The applicants will need to get variances for front and side yard setbacks and have filed an application with the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mrs. Bitar said the fence is proposed to be a wood picket fence, similar to what is in the rear. The openings between the pickets will be the same as the picket width, and the fence will be painted white. Staff felt even though the fence extends out beyond the house it is an appropriate style and placement for this location.

Mr. Hunter asked for the applicant and. Mrs. Lorraine Robinson approached the microphone and stated she lives at 195 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Robinson said they will also be replacing the old fence. The wood is Amish white oak. Mrs. Robinson explained she wants to create a play yard for her small children.

Mr. Sauer said he understands why she needs a fence, but noticed the neighboring yards had fences that were lower. He said her fence measured 54", and the neighbors fences were 44". Mr. Sauer asked if her fence could be lowered to match the others in the neighborhood. Mr. Robinson stepped up to the microphone and stated their current plan is to make the fence 48" high. He said the existing pickets are 47" inches and are 1" off the ground, so the intention would be four feet or less. Mr. Sauer said most of the neighbors have picket boards that are wider and the thinner boards make the fence look taller. Mr. Sauer suggested the fence height should be 44" to match the fences in neighboring yards. Mr. and Mrs. Robinson said they were fine with that height. Mrs. Robinson asked if there were any specifications about the points on the ends of the pickets and if they had to be rounded. Mr. Sauer said the points should not be sharp enough to hurt someone. Mr. Hunter said the supporting members need to be on the inside of the fence.

Mrs. Robinson said she checked with her neighbors and all were very supportive of the fence project. She said regarding the placement, she thought the fence should be along the gravel driveway, which is in the right-of-way. Mrs. Bitar asked if Mrs. Robinson thought about car overhang when deciding where to put the fence. Mrs. Robinson said yes, and she thought she might need to place some sort of parking bumper to keep cars from hitting the fence. Mr. Hunter said that placing a parking block next to the fence may cause the vehicles to be too close to Plymouth Street.

Mr. Sauer suggested having three or four feet between the gravel drive and the fence. He said most people would drive up to the edge of the gravel to park, and if the fence were on the gravel line, people would hit the fence. If the fence was moved further up into the yard, they would not have to worry about people hitting the fence. Mr. Hunter said it would also be safer for people to walk in front of their cars to get inside, than to walk around the back of the vehicle that would be located closer to Plymouth Street.

Mrs. Robinson asked if she could plant, and mulch on the City portion of the property. Mr. Sauer said small plantings are fine, but you do not want to put anything close to the corner of the intersection that would obstruct the view of oncoming cars. Mr. Hunter asked if Mrs. Robinson had a pin survey done and she said yes. He asked where the line was in relation to the concrete sidewalk to the east side of the house. Mr. Robinson indicated that part of the sidewalk is on City property.

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

Findings of fact:

1. The applicants would like to construct a fence to enclose the side yard east of the house that would align with the front of the house. Variances for front and side yard setback would be

required with this proposal

2. A 44" high open style picket fence is proposed, which will match the existing fence along the rear property line. The fence will be painted white.

Conclusions:

1. Although the proposed fence would be in the required setback area, placement is appropriate at this location.
2. The style is in character with this property and the District.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE LORRAINE & DAVID ROBINSON FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE AS PER CASE NO. AR 19-13, DRAWINGS NO. AR 19-13, DATED MARCH 29, 2013, AS AMENDED THAT THE FENCE WILL BE NO HIGHER THAN 44" TALL, THE FENCE WILL HAVE 50% TRANSPARENCY, AND THE FENCE MAY BE PLACED ON THE EAST PROPERTY LINE, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye, and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

b. Driveway Gate – 105 W. North St. (David & Patricia Rankey) AR 20-13

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application and displayed photographs. She said the driveway was recently redone with pavers and looks very nice. Staff felt the gate looked appropriate and had no concerns.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Rankey approached the microphone and stated his address is 105 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Rankey said the paver driveway was just finished about a week ago, and previously in the back they had a 4' foot cedar fence that ran from the deck to the corner of their garage to keep their dogs in the yard. Replacing it in the same location would have obstructed the view of the driveway. Mr. Rankey explained the details and mechanics of the gate. Mr. Hunter 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. A black metal gate is proposed to cross the drive near the rear of this house.

2. The style is compatible with the black metal fencing enclosing the rear yard.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed gate is appropriate

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE DAVID AND PATRICIA RANKEY FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A GATE ACROSS THE DRIVEWAY AT 105 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 20-13, DRAWINGS NO. AR 20-13, DATED APRIL 1, 2013, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye, and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

c. Amendments to New Buildings – **890 & 910 High St.** (MK&K Realty, Inc.) **AR 17-13** (Amendment to AR 65-12)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said the Board originally approved revisions to the buildings that were to be constructed south of CVS at the July 26, 2012 meeting. She said the original application was approved on July 26, 2012 with the following conditions:

- That both buildings be constructed at the same time
- That a landscape plan be submitted for approval, along with details of the arch, and colors for bicycle racks, railings, trash receptacles and benches
- That the screening around the recycling bins be higher so as to cover them from sight

This application addresses many of those conditions.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the hearing of the application in order to seek legal opinion on whether it is appropriate for the Board to review this application at this time in light of the ongoing litigation between MK&K Realty and the City of Worthington about this piece of property. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion to table the application. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone that wished to comment.

Mr. David Watkins approached the microphone and stated he is the applicant's attorney. His address is at the Plank Law Firm, 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio. He said the Certificate of Appropriateness was originally approved in July of 2012, and at that time the Board recommended there were certain conditions that had to be met. MK&K Realty has submitted a new application that addresses the issues and their Architect Mr. Ford, was present to talk about those issues. It was Mr. Watkins understanding that staff had recommended approval of the application at this point in time.

Mr. Watkins said he was not familiar with the rules and regulations of the Architectural Review Board. He asked if there is a procedure for tabling an application without a request. Mr. Hunter said yes, and that it has been done before. Mr. Watkins asked if the reason was to seek a legal opinion and Mr. Coulter affirmed stating the Board needed to seek an opinion from their counsel. Mr. Coulter said the Board was aware this application was coming up as of last week, but was also aware of the litigation. The Board was unsure how to proceed until they knew for sure how the case was pending before the courts.

Mr. Watkins asked if the application would be tabled indefinitely, or if it was possible to get another date before they left. Mr. Hunter said he was unsure because they did not know the status of the litigation, and he could not determine what the next date would be. Mr. Watkins wanted to make it clear to the Board that he and his client are prepared to go forward. Mr. Hunter asked for members to vote on tabling the application. All members said, "aye".

d. Signage and Building Changes – **660 High St.** (Robert Couchman/Jet's Pizza) **AR 18-13**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application and passed around signage color samples to the Board members. The existing external illumination proposed for use with the signs is crooked on the wall. She said the wall sign is narrower than what is there now, and it will be just over the entry door. The other part of the proposal is to put a sign on the existing bracket projected from the building, similar in style to the wall sign.

Mrs. Bitar described the changes to the rear of the building. A walk-in cooler, which is a prefabricated unit, will be added to the back of the building. The applicant plans to remove the canopy over the door and install new mechanical equipment on the roof. They may also remove some of the existing equipment on the roof that is no longer in use, but it is up to the building owner to approve that. Mrs. Bitar was not sure what the finish of the proposed cooler is, but said they are supposed to paint it to match the building. A service door will also be added next to the cooler, and be painted to match the building, and a glass entry door is proposed at the north end. Mrs. Bitar said the back of the building is not very attractive and staff feels adding a prefabricated cooler on the back and additional equipment does not improve the look. Staff would like to see something a little bit different than just an added box on the back of the building, and if there was a way to screen some of the equipment or remove what is already there, that would be an improvement.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robert Couchman approached the microphone and stated he lives at 116 Kitdare Dr., Delaware, Ohio 43015. Mr. Couchman said they do have some ideas to clean up the back area of the building. He said there was a cooler used in that location previously, and Mrs. Bitar showed a picture of the former cooler, which was in a slightly different location and was a different size.

Mr. Hunter said he appreciates what Mr. Couchman is doing and spending to make this building look better. He said he did not have a problem with the signage at all. Mr. Hunter said he would

like to see what changes are proposed to the back of the building. Mr. Couchman said he would like get in the building and start construction if the exterior changes are not approved. Mr. Couchman said he would have his architect discuss further details.

Mr. Michael Lambert approached the microphone and stated he is the applicant's architect. He said it is a challenging remodel due to the age of the building. Mr. Lambert said they are dealing with a grade differential of about ten and a half inches between the back parking lot and the interior floor level. In order to accommodate accessibility for the handicapped, they have located the door under the existing fire stairway.

Mr. Lambert said they have agreed they would like to see some improvement to the back of the building also. They will dress up the new walk-in cooler and they have the approval of the landlord to remove the smog hog that has rusted out and is no longer used, located at the upper level of the roof. On the second level of the roof the hvac unit will be staying but towards the south end of the roof, the hood shroud will be removed. The vent stack above the Port-a-john will be removed; it was an old water heater flue. It will be relocated into the basement. Another vent pipe located behind the stairwell will also be removed.

Mr. Lambert discussed the location of the two proposed air conditioning units to be placed upon the rooftop. They will also be adding an exhaust fan. He said the units can be positioned a little closer to the front of the building so they will be less apparent in the back of the building. He feels there is enough of a parapet on the front of the building that you will not be able to see any of the mechanical units from High Street.

Mr. Coulter asked how close the mechanical unit on the lower floor is to the edge of the roof. Mr. Lambert said it is probably five or six feet from the edge of the roof. Mr. Coulter suggested putting up a 36" screen at both the lower and upper levels to block the sight lines when you are standing in the parking lot looking up. He said it is logical to have the man door under the stairs. Mr. Coulter said getting rid of the old equipment is a huge plus and will help clean up the roof, and take away some leak points later on. He also said he would like to see how Mr. Lambert proposes to dress up the walk-in cooler.

Mr. Lambert said they are planning to add a fence that runs from the corner of the walk-in cooler to the building to the south. He said it will serve a couple of functions there. It will screen the existing electrical equipment on the back wall of the building and it will also help with security. They have to pour a slab to make up for the difference in the grade for the walk-in cooler. They are considering doing a stud wall around it and clad it with fiber cement lap siding, similar to Hardiplank, or Nitchiha. It would look like wood siding and would be painted to match the building. They would cover as much of the block as possible.

Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Lambert could remove the canopy over the second story door. Mr. Couchman said a lot of things they are discussing will need to be approved by the owner of the building. Mr. Bob Cummins approached the microphone and stated he is the owner of 660 High St., and he resides at 2020 Roundwyck Lane, Powell, Ohio 43065. Mr. Cummins said he is happy to do anything reasonable to fix up the back of the building. The canopy on the second floor can come out. He said if they have to put a parapet wall on the second floor he is worried

about how it would physically attach to the roof, how the water would drain, and obscuring his second floor tenant's view out of the windows. He said the ugly equipment has already been planned to be removed.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Couchman where he planned for his pizza delivery drivers to park. Mr. Couchman said there will be two to three spaces available near the bollards at the back of their building. Mr. Couchman was fine with adding more light to the rear of the building for safety reasons. Mr. Hunter asked to discuss the lighting fixtures on the front of the building. Mr. Couchman said he planned to use the existing fixtures and keep the same look of the building. The Board members asked Mr. Couchman if he would straighten up the fixtures, and Mr. Couchman said that he would.

Mr. Sauer asked if the font on the building sign would be the same as the logo on Mr. Couchman's shirt, and Mr. Couchman said no, the building sign is different, it will have white lettering. Mr. Sauer was concerned about the font style. Mr. Couchman said his shirt's logo is what their neon sign looks like. Mr. Sauer said the style of the building and sign are of a certain period and character, and the font looks like it is from a different era. Mr. Couchman said he has to follow corporate guidelines, and the font has to do with their registered trademark.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if there was any signage proposed for the back of the building. Mr. Couchman said they were going to try to come up with some type of proposal, just so customers would know where they were. Mr. Myers asked if they were going to have any directional signage. Mr. Lambert asked the Board if they would be allowed to have something similar to what is on the front of the building but have it placed on the parapet between the two doors, or so that it is visible from the parking lot. Because of a comment made from Mr. Couchman, Mrs. Rodgers wanted to confirm that there were not going to be any neon signs on the building, and Mr. Couchman said no.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Couchman if he was sure he had enough parking for three delivery cars after the cooler is installed because it comes out about 14' feet from the wall. Mr. Couchman said he was pretty confident that he still has enough room. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Couchman if he could bring back measurements of the back area when he comes back with his sign package for the back area, and Mr. Couchman said yes. Mr. Myers said he felt Mr. Couchman may need to put signs on the back of the cooler which say, "Delivery Parking Only". Mr. Myers also believes Mr. Couchman may want a directional sign for customers since the back door is hidden. Mr. Hunter thought that Mr. Couchman may need a fifth bollard to protect the wood fence. Members agreed those items would need to come back for approval.

Mr. Sauer had a suggestion that if the same sign on the front of the building was put on the back, a smaller version, and a goose neck light, such as the ones in the front, it would help to illuminate the back; and it would help direct customers to that entrance. Mr. Couchman said he would explore the options. Mr. Couchman said that he plans to open the business in about twelve weeks after getting their permit.

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

Mrs. Bitar told Mr. Couchman that interior illuminated window signs are not allowed. She also expressed concern about blocking the windows with the parapet. Mr. Coulter said it would be six inches higher than in Option 4, making it 42” inches high. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Lambert what part of the back would be painted green. Mr. Lambert said the trim around the doors, the corners on the walk-in cooler, the vertical wood board, and along the parapet. There are no plans to paint green trim on the second floor.

Mrs. Bitar asked if they would be repainting the trim on the front of the building and Mr. Couchman said that would be fine. Mrs. Lloyd asked about the fence and if it would be cedar. Mr. Sauer asked if it could be painted to match the building and Mr. Lambert said that would be fine. They will also paint the bollards to match building.

There were no other speakers.

Findings of fact:

1. This application is a request to install wall and projection signs on the front of the building (making use of existing goose-neck lights for external illumination), a walk-in cooler and two new doors on the rear of the building, and various roof-top mechanical equipment.
2. The wall sign will consist of raised metal lettering and a border mounted on a 2” thick composite panel painted “Cordovan” (Sherwin Williams #6027). The proposed border will be 1” deep metal painted gold (Sherwin Williams #6395 “Alchemy”). The letters are proposed to be 1” deep metal painted white (Sherwin Williams #7010 “White Duck”). The sign is approximately 20 square feet in area.
3. A projection sign of the same style and colors as the wall sign is proposed to extend from the building near the entrance. The sign is approximately 1 square foot in area per side.
4. To the rear of the building, placement of a pre-fabricated walk-in cooler is the proposed. The unit is approximately 14’ x 14’ and will be sided with a cementitious lap siding and painted to match the front of the building. The siding will also cover the existing exposed block on the wall and a new 42” high parapet that will extend up at the edge of the first floor roof. The cooler is proposed in front of the existing door and extends south. The existing canopy above the door is planned for removal. A new service door is proposed next to the cooler, and an entry door is proposed at the north end of the building. A canopy above the second floor door will also be removed. A fence will extend from the cooler south to the building wall.
5. New mechanical equipment is proposed for the upper roof area. The applicant plans to remove existing equipment that is no longer used. The new equipment is not supposed to be visible from High St., but will be visible from the rear.
6. As part of the Conditional Use Permit approval, there was discussion of delivery drivers parking in the area proposed for the cooler. The applicant feels there is enough space for 3 cars, but will verify when approval for lighting and signage in the rear is sought.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed signage is appropriate.
2. The proposed changes to the rear should be an improvement.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT COUCHMAN FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNAGE ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING, AND EQUIPMENT AND DOORS ON THE REAR AND ROOF OF THE BUILDING AT 660 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 18-13, DRAWINGS NO. AR 18-13, DATED MARCH 29, 2013 AND APRIL 11, 2013, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- REMOVE THE UPPER CANOPY
- THAT OPTION 4 BE ACCEPTED BUT THE PARAPET WALL BE 42" INCHES HIGH
- THAT ALL DEAD EQUIPMENT BE REMOVED FROM THE ROOF
- THE FRONT LIGHTS BE REPAIRED AND STRAIGHTENED
- THAT THE COLORS ON THE BACK MATCH THE COLORS ON THE FRONT
- THAT PARKING AND SIGNAGE FOR THE BACK WILL COME BACK FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL
- THE TRIM ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING WILL BE RE-PAINTED THE SAME COLOR AS IT IS NOW
- BOLLARDS PAINTED TO MATCH BUILDING COLOR

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

Mr. Sauer asked a question about the temporary signage at J Liu, and was told it was approved.

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members said, "aye". The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.