



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

Office of the Clerk of Council
200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Jennifer Tisone Price, Chair

David B. Thom, Vice Chair

David K. Andrews

Joe Keehner

Kristin Rosan

Donald R. Shepherd

Thomas J. Wester

Donna L. Jernigan, Sr. Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, January 11, 2012

7:10 PM

City Hall

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO HAVE A COURT REPORTER PRESENT, AT THE APPLICANT'S EXPENSE, IF THEY WISH TO HAVE A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING. COUNCIL OFFICE SHOULD BE ADVISED IN ADVANCE IF A COURT REPORTER IS GOING TO BE PRESENT.

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 S. Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, December 21, 2011. The agenda for this meeting was published on January 6, 2012. Chair Jennifer Price called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Present 5 - Jennifer Tisone Price, David K. Andrews, David B. Thom, Donald R. Shepherd, and Joe Keehner

Present 5 - Jennifer Tisone Price, David K. Andrews, David B. Thom, Donald R. Shepherd, and Joe Keehner

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.

Clerk stated that DR-0027-2011 would be added under Unfinished Business

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 21, 2011

A motion was made to approve the December 21, 2011 minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

Yes: 7 - Price, Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd, Wester and Keehner

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA.

There were none.

E. APPLICATIONS:

Chair stated Public Hearing Rules that would govern all public hearings this evening. City Attorney Shane Ewald administered an oath to those persons wishing to address the Commission.

[V-0001-2012](#)

Gard reviewed the application with the Commission.

Gary Dunn, 5103 Pine Creek Drive, Westerville, stated he was the contractor on this project; the use of the building is to become a nurse practitioner clinic; garage will be converted into office space; 2 to 3 exam rooms; will hopefully be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood; would like to have the parking close and accessible to the front entrance; we think the request is consistent with the area. Dianne Nelson Houser, 933 Eastchester Drive, Gahanna, stated she was a certified family nurse practitioner; will be a health care facility to provide primary care for the residents in this area; nurse practitioners operate with consistent quality health care at a reasonable cost.

Chair asked for any opponents.

Linda Fisher, 336 Amfield Court; stated she was the property owner adjacent to this property; lived at this house for 13 and a half years; been in this neighborhood for over 30 years; Allens owned that house for 55 years; looked at the fact they will be putting parking spots in front of that house; not being conducive to my property and community; their spots will be 10 yards from my driveway; I will see parking; have to look at traffic in neighborhood; already a lot of traffic in the area; having people coming in and out of neighborhood with parking spots that have to back out on street; will be backing over sidewalk; will not be safe for anybody that walks in the neighborhood; because it is a health care clinic there will be drugs to take care of; biohazard waste; what will be the security; where will the trash bin be located; how will that be taken care of; if you are trying to pull patients from nursing home, where will they cross; there is a shopping center across the way that is already zoned for commercial; 8 out of 10 businesses fail; who else is going to go in there if this fails; researched how this property got zoned commercial; it appears it happened in 1973 when the city went from village to city; those two properties got zoned community commercial by the city; think the city made a mistake; was not requested by the owner; we want it to be a house; very much opposed to this.

James Sprouse, 133 Moorfield Drive; stated from 4 to 7 p.m. we can't even get out on to Stygler; our grandkids walk in front of that house; what are they going to do with the sidewalks when someone is backing over them; there are storefronts that are empty; if this is going to be for people in Royal Manor put it on that side; don't want my property values to go down; came here the last time an auto parts store wanted to go there; City said there would be no commercial north of there; up to the dentist office was as far as it was supposed to go; someone is making money; we don't want it; it is not in our interest; if it goes in, I am going to move; getting sick of all this stuff; my granddaughter comes to visit me and can't use the tennis courts or tracks; have all these young people that don't live in Gahanna; have all this stuff to bring people in and we are the ones that pay the bill; something has to stop; we were promised when an auto parts store tried to come in that it wouldn't happen; too much traffic in that area.

Dunn stated the property is already zoned commercial; we could install the parking lot to the east; would be extensive parking that is even closer to Fisher's property;

realistic objection is the cars backing out; that is not a heavily travelled road; we don't expect our facility to be busy at rush hour; applicant already owns the property; use of the property will be for what they intend; we feel the variance is a reasonable request.

Thom stated you mentioned this is going to be owned by nurse practitioners; is there a medical doctor and rules and regulations to oversee the practice. Houser stated we are required to work in collaboration with a physician; we do not practice under their supervision; we have semi annual chart reviews but we are not mandated to have over the shoulder supervision. Thom stated he would like to have that physician's name on record. Gard reminded the Commission that this is a permitted use for the zoning. Thom asked if there was any remodeling to be done other than the parking; will there be signage. Gard stated any signage would require a DR. Thom asked if there would be remodeling to the house. Dunn stated yes. Wester asked if a traffic study had been done. Dunn stated it was not requested by the City; we could achieve the parking in a different manner. Wester asked how will they access these parking spots. Dunn stated most will come off of Stygler and turn into parking lot. Wester clarified they would back out into Amfield Court and asked if the curb cut would be about 200 feet. Dunn stated it would be a little less because it is already existing. Wester asked about the sidewalk in that area. Dunn stated it will not be eliminated. Wester asked if the sidewalk is on both sides of the street. Dunn stated our parking will be at the right of way line; sidewalk will be in the same place as it is currently. Rosan asked about trash bins. Dunn stated this facility is not going to generate sufficient waste for a dumpster. Houser stated there will be an outside service that comes to pick up the bio hazard waste; there will be no drugs stored at this practice either. Rosan asked about people crossing Stygler Road trying to reach the practice; has that been looked at and is it a concern. Wetherholt stated we have not looked at that. Rosan asked how many patients are expected on any given day. Houser stated it will vary between 30 and 90. Rosan asked about the business hours. Houser stated we will be open 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Rosan asked about the comments on an auto parts store; has there been any research to see if there were any commitments made to the residents. Gard answered no; there has been a lot of interest in this parcel as Community Commercial; auto parts has come up a couple of times but that would require a Conditional Use. Rosan asked if the applicant had looked at the parking lot going on the north side. Dunn stated this parcel is served with a septic system; certain locations on the site could require removal of the system depending on where it was located; our desire was to provide parking as close to our entrance as possible. Rosan asked if there would be exterior renovations. Dunn stated we will be removing all of the siding; painting and landscaping; will be doing the necessary improvements; new windows; we are going to work hard to keep the structure looking residential in nature, other than necessary parking. Rosan asked if the exterior renovation would require an FDP or DR. Gard stated no because they are not increasing the building footprint; and a DR would only be required if the changes are substantially different. Rosan asked if the parking goes on the east side could significant screening be requested. Gard stated that would be through a DR. Thom stated you mentioned a septic system; when there is a change in ownership isn't there a requirement to connect to the City's sewer system. Wetherholt stated that if a property is within 200 feet of a public sewer they are required to connect; ordinarily we don't force that issue unless there is a problem with the existing system; our water resources engineer didn't have a problem with the change of use; if anything happened to the system they would need to hook into the public sewer at the eastern edge of the property. Keehner asked if they are changing it from a residential use would there be a further strain on the septic system that could cause that system to no longer be adequate. Dunn stated we will actually be reducing the strain because there will be no laundry or showers. Keehner stated he would like to see some alternatives to the locations for the parking spaces. Dunn stated we can't deny we can accomplish parking in a different manner; not a major corporation; we

are a small business attempting to do what we think is a tremendous business for the neighborhood; not sure that a curb cut on Stygler would make sense. Andrews stated he lives around the corner and knows how the traffic situation is; my concern is also for all the cars coming in and out on Amfield; would rather have one way in and out; instead of having 12 spaces back out; have screening for neighbors to have little less view of parking lot. Shepherd stated if the parking spots are tight it would be hard to open car doors; whenever I look at a variance I look to see if there is another way to accomplish the goal without a variance; would recommend screening; suggested putting it on the east side; could be closer to the garage. Dunn stated we want to be a good neighbor; if we design a parking lot to code we don't need a variance but will it still require a ruling. Gard stated it will still need a Design Review. Dunn asked is it possible to amend our application tonight. City Attorney stated if you are altering the plan it should go to a workshop.

RECOMMENDATION: To Be Heard in Workshop on January 18th at 6:30 p.m.

[V-0002-2012](#)

Gard reviewed the application with the commission

Shawn McNeil, 370 Charleston Avenue; stated this is a large property; house was built with a 2 car garage could use a three car garage; house is located closer to the east property line; wouldn't make sense on the right side of the house; a detached garage would require significant paving; good location; good design; same colors and materials. Randall Lucas, 282 Spruce Hill Drive; stated he could answer any questions; wanted to see what his options were.

Chair asked for any opponents. There were none.

Keehner stated he drove past there; lots look similar; understand the need for more space; notes from the city said that there are some other lots that have these smaller setbacks; are there any kind of issues with utility boxes and fire hydrants if the driveway is expanded. McNeil stated there are cable and power lines. Keehner asked if there was an issue with the fire hydrant. Wetherholt stated it is within the street right of way; not expanding the approach of the driveway. Keehner asked if the neighbors are okay with it. Lucas stated he had spoken to the neighbors; haven't had anyone express opposition; did pull up on Auditor's website that there are at least 2 other properties on Spruce Hill Drive that have additions. Gard read the three criteria that have to be met for the Planning Commission to approve a variance. Shepherd stated he read over the hardship statement; is there another way to accomplish this without having a garage; could a shed or outbuilding work. Lucas stated that would be up to the city; not sure of any codes. Gard stated there could be deed restrictions that would prohibit that. Shepherd asked without violating that setback is there a way to build a structure that would house yard care equipment. McNeil stated he didn't think it would blend in as well as a garage. Shepherd asked how long have you owned the property. Lucas stated 12 years; have had a buddy with a lawn care service take care of it until now. Wester asked how does this impact drainage; does that lot drain to the front or back. Wetherholt stated we haven't examined the drainage at this location; in general it drains into the preserve. Thom asked if there was an easement between the property lines. Wetherholt stated he didn't believe city utilities went through there.

Thom stated he would be voting against this; concerned about the precedent that could be set with other homes; may have to continually grant reductions in side yard setbacks; don't see where there is a major hardship. Shepherd stated he would not be in support of the variance as well; they are for particular situations; this is not a true hardship; can still enjoy the use of the property. Wester stated he will not

support it as well; sympathize with owner; a lot of thought was put into this development and we may not see the logic at this point.

A motion was made by Thom, seconded by Rosan, that this matter be Approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 2 - Price and Keehner

No: 5 - Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd and Wester

Yes: 2 - Price and Keehner

No: 5 - Rosan, Andrews, Thom, Shepherd and Wester

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

[DR-0027-2011](#)

Chair noted this application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

[DR-0001-2012](#)

Gard reviewed the application with the Commission.

Terry Killilea, 899 Old Pine Drive; stated the fence would have stone pillars; plan on hanging some flowers on the outside of the fence; showed a sample of the stone; very solid; will put a footer underneath it.

Chair asked for any opponents. There were none.

Thom asked if the wall will continue to the rear of building. Killilea stated it would go to the existing kitchen area; now is a privacy fence. Andrews stated he was thrilled about this; old fence was starting to look dated. Shepherd asked if the new fence would join the privacy fence. Killilea stated that would be part of a Phase 2; might take a year or two before they could do that. Wester asked about the two trees. Killilea stated they will be taken out. Wester asked about the drive on the south side; what about the line of site; approaches to Hamilton Road. Wetherholt stated he will have to take a look at it; quite a distance from the sidewalk to back of the wall don't think that is a problem; there is a long strip between the sidewalk; adequate distance for someone in that driveway approach going north on Hamilton Road. Wester asked would it obscure the view of the driver for the pedestrian. Wetherholt stated it may be more of an issue with the landscaping. Killilea stated the sidewalk is 11 feet from the curb; plenty of view going down Hamilton Road. Wester asked how far the west edge of the sidewalk is to the base of column. Killilea stated it was a foot and a half to the sidewalk. Shepherd asked if staff is confident they wouldn't have any issues with pedestrian traffic it should be fine; could have issues with landscaping. Killilea stated there won't be any trees; annual plantings only and nothing taller than 12 inches. Wetherholt stated the wall is very close to the sidewalk; if there were a diagonal across there it might help with pulling out of the driveway; fairly close to where wall is going to go; small amount of room to see person on sidewalk; need to provide pedestrian site distance; will see a lot more pedestrians in the future. Killilea stated he could come up with something similar. Thom stated he would like to see what you planning for landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: To be heard in Workshop prior to the Regular Meeting on January 25th at 6:30 p.m.

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Hamilton Road Corridor Committee

Andrews was appointed to serve on the Committee.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney.

No report.

City Engineer.

No report.

Department of Development.

Gard stated a number of properties have been inquired about; excited for the new year; will double check on other homes that have additions on Spruce Hill to see if a variance would be required; would have had to pull permits.

Chair.

Chair stated she was looking forward to a great year.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.

None.

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Andrews asked about the commercial property on Stygler; why didn't it get switched back to residential. Gard stated we don't initiate that type of zoning for individual lots.

L. ADJOURNMENT.

Adjourned at 8:40 p.m.; Motion by Rosan

M. POSTPONED APPLICATIONS:

