

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 12, 2002

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

Richard A. Peck, Chair

Jane Turley, Vice Chair

Cynthia G. Canter

Candace Greenblott

P. Frank O'Hare

Donald R. Shepherd

Othelda A. Spencer

Tanya M. Word, Deputy Clerk of Council

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL.

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, June 12, 2002. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 6, 2002. Chair Richard A. Peck called the meeting to order at 7:07 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission member, Jane Turley.

Members Absent: Candace Greenblott

Members Present: Richard Peck, Jane Turley and P. Frank O'Hare

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: - None****D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA - None****E. APPLICATIONS:**

Chair stated Public Hearing Rules that would govern all public hearings this evening. Assistant City Attorney Ray King administered an oath to those persons wishing to present testimony this evening.

Z-0007-2002

To consider a zoning application on 38.8 acres of annexed property located on the North side of Taylor Road immediately east of Rice Avenue; requested zoning of SF-3 ROD; Homewood, by J.C. Hanks, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:09 P.M.

J.C. Hanks, attorney for Homewood Corporation, 750 Northlawn Drive, Columbus, OH, stated that he would like to go through some of the items that were discussed last week during workshop; some of the efforts that we have gone through to make this application as smooth as possible are: making sure that we have addressed the concerns and questions of the residents at Rathburn Woods; have had a number of meetings with the City; addressed concerns that the City had; had a representative from EMH&T do a number of studies regarding storm drainage and soil borings to make sure there were no problems; there were no problems that we could foresee to face us in the future; one issue that was raised at the workshop that I would like to touch on now is I was asked to contact ODNR (specifically Stu Lewis) about concerns they might have regarding the spraying for mosquitos; know there have been some concerns about mosquitos; ODNR's response was as long as the spraying was done in Foxwood, they had no problem with it and was not concerned with the various chemicals that may be in the spray; however, they would have a problem if the City was intending to spray in the preserve or nature area itself; think that we have a good working relationship with ODNR; given some conditions which are outlined in our application, ODNR is in support of this sub-division; we intend to continue to work with ODNR significantly in the future as far as inserts, enclosures, educational type material that will discuss invasive plants and other issues and behavior that is appropriate in the preserve; again we have met with members of Rathburn Woods Association; we have successfully addressed their concerns and issues; the sub-division as a whole is not in opposition; however, we understand that there will always be individuals who will have problems or reservations for one reason or another.

Linda Menerey, stated that we had discussion about the preservation zone along the west and east property lines; there was some discussion as to whether or not we would be

willing to extend that preservation zone on a couple of lots; lots 10 & 17, there are some trees in the back of these lots and we would be more than happy to extend the preservation zone there; also there is lots 6 & 7, we would extend the preservation zone there as well; there was discussion about lots 1-4, there is somewhat of a drainage issue back there already; we would like to be able to get some of the drainage through there in terms of some pipes, etc. to try work through some of that; for that reason we are not going to extend the preservation zone on lots 1-4 because they need to get in there and do some work; there was also some discussion about whether or not we would do the same thing with converting the conservation easement to a preservation zone; we would be more than happy to do that if the Commission requests that we do that; as Hanks stated we went through in detail and talked about the educational materials that we will be giving out at the sales office; will have signage that will designate the conservation and preservation zones; they will read something like conservation easement or preservation zone.

Chair asked for Opponents.

Joe Kohler, 1215 Rice Avenue, stated that he wanted to remind the Planning Commission that this particular area is a very damp area; the City will be faced with wet basements and citizens who will be complaining about the mosquito issue; need to realize that this is not a place where you want to build houses; as the complaints come in, the City is going to have to react and fix these problems which will cost the City money.

Chair asked for Rebuttal.

Greg Comfort, Managing Partner, EMH&T, stated we have done soil investigations as well as a number of borings all along the property; looking for two things (1) the quality of the soil in order to build on in terms of the foundation and its strength; (2) ground water relevant to any potential problems that you may have with basements or sump pumps that may run for long periods of time; in the areas that are not being developed in the wetlands or green space to the east, obviously those are not buildable areas and we are not building there for obvious reasons; in the areas that are designated for the lots and the streets, all indications are from all the soil borings that we have done which has been very extensive, is that the soil is very adequate for construction and that there is not a ground water problem out there; the gentleman suggested and he is correct at saying that there are wet areas out there; a lot of Central Ohio has wet areas and a lot of them have been developed very successfully; that is the purpose of coming in and doing a detailed grading plan, putting in an adequate drainage plan, etc. to make sure there is not a permanent problem or situation.

O'Hare stated that he had reviewed the soil report; in the report you make reference to test pits; asked could you explain to the Planning Commission what a test pit is. Comfort stated there are actually two ways you can do a soil investigation; one is where you actually do a boring and go down and take the core and look at that; a test pit is where you go down with a back hoe and actually dig a hole; it's more of a real live situation of what you're going to get when you're digging a basement or doing an excavation; when you dig the hole you can look down into the hole and see the water coming in; a lot of times, test pits provide much better information than just traditional borings; borings usually go deeper. O'Hare stated that when he read the report. the test pits indicated there were no problems with the water in the area. Comfort stated that is correct; there is not a ground water problem; there is some surface drainage that needs to be repaired. Peck asked is it your opinion that the standing water on the surface will be adequately addressed by proper contouring. Comfort stated that is correct.

Canter asked if the soils that you found on the site are similar to those of Rathburn Woods. Comfort replied it varies a little; basically it's similar to communities in the area that have been built.

Turley confirmed that Homewood Corporation is willing to extend the preservation to the lots that Menerey outlined in her testimony. Hanks stated yes; we will commit to doing what Menerey stated in her testimony.

Spencer asked do we need a revised drawing for the files. Sherwood stated the Council Office would need revised copies to submit to Council.

Hanks stated that there had been discussion about changing the conservation easement language to preservation zone; we're happy to do either; however, we would need some direction from the Planning Commission as to what you would prefer. Turley stated that she thought it should be changed to preservation zone, but since it's going to be under State jurisdiction eventually, then call it conservation easement.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:26 P.M.

O'Hare stated he has reviewed the soil report, the report was prepared by one of the top premier soil firms in Central Ohio; a firm that deals with everything from the big buildings in downtown Columbus to some of our major dams in the Midwest; their report was very extensive; as Comfort stated their test pits were beyond the normal testing of soils and how to approach water problems; the soils report as Comfort stated does not show a major problem for a residential development; however, as residential developments go, sump pumps are put into every basement; will support this application; want to commend the applicant for an extensive investigation and excellent presentation.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Turley that this matter be Recommended to Council for Approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley and O'Hare
Absent	1	Greenblott

V-0016-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1141.08(c) - Yard Requirements; for property located at 1284 Totten Drive; to reduce the required side yard minimum on the north side of lot 66 from 5.0' to 4.3' to accommodate house that was improperly surveyed by applicant; by Hoy Surveying Services, Inc., John C. Gallagher, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/16/02). (Public Hearing held on 5/22/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:31 P.M.

Chair read letter from applicant requesting a withdrawal of application.

Closed Public Hearing at 7:31 P.M.

Withdrawn

CU-0003-2002

To consider a Conditional Use application for a double lane drive-thru pharmacy; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:32 P.M.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, apologized for his unprofessional behavior

demonstrated at workshop last week; stated he would like to make a request that this package be tabled to workshop for June 19th then back to Public Hearing on June 26th.

Peck stated that the following issues will be discussed in workshop:

- Traffic (Right-In)
- Retail Center
- Landscaping Issue (Terracing, more trees)
- Reader Board

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:36 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

FDP-0004-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Gahanna Properties, L.L.C. to be located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

V-0007-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10(a) - On-Premises Wall Signs (Number Permitted; Purpose); to increase the number of wall signs on the primary and secondary frontage from one to five; to add a directional sign on the east elevation; 1165.10(b) - On-Premises Wall Signs (Permitted Display Surface); 1153.04(c)(7) - CC-2 Community Commercial Modified District; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Walgreen's by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 03/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0019-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Walgreen's by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

V-0008-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10 - On-Premises Wall Signs; to increase the total number of wall signs for more than one sign; 1163.02(a) - Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required (Schedule of Parking Spaces); to allow less than the minimum number of parking spaces required; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Bob Evans Farms, Inc. by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 3/27/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02, and 7/24/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0020-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Site Development; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Bob Evans by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

V-0015-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1165.10(a) - On-Premises Wall Signs; (Variance to increase wall signs on primary (Hamilton) and secondary (Giant Eagle Drive) frontage to two; Primary wall is Hamilton; secondary is Morse; 1163.02(a) - Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required; for property located at Morse & Hamilton Roads (Lot D); to allow two wall signs; to allow less than the minimum number of parking spaces; Tumbleweed Southwest Grill by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/16/02). (Public Hearing held on 5/22/02, 6/12/02, 6/26/02, and 7/24/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0032-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads (Lot D); Tumbleweed Southwest Grill by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

DR-0018-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for a strip center; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

SWP-0002-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 8.963 of acres; for property located at Morse and Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

V-0017-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08 - Yard Requirements; for property located at 690 Affirmed Court; to allow a fence in a no-build zone; by Charles & Sherry Breitenbach, applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02 and 6/26/02).

Chair opened at 7:37 P.M.

Charles Breitenbach, 690 Affirmed Court; stated that he & his wife own the property at 690 Affirmed Court; purchased the property from Robert & Karen Rawls on June 20, 1995; the fence which is in question was erected on or about April 16, 1991 by Michael Fox who owned the property at that time; the reason I know this date to be accurate is that Gahanna Zoning Commission granted zoning certificates on a pool permit which I do have a copy of; do not have a copy of the fence permit; it is my statement that the fence in question was not erected by me; any modification would impose hardship to my wife & I; spoke to both my bordering neighbors and they both have stated they do not have a problem with where the fence is currently located.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M.

Spencer asked if prices had been acquired to relocate this particular portion of the fence. Breitenbach replied no he had not. Turley asked what is located within the triangular shape in the no-build zone. Breitenbach replied rose bushes and there was a tree there at

one time. Peck stated so is it the understanding that the only encroachment in the no-build zone is the triangle that we see. Breitenbach replied that is correct. O'Hare confirmed with Breitenbach that the fence is all on his property. Breitenbach replied yes it is. Peck commented to King that we had a similar situation recently; Breitenbach has testified that there was City approval at least for the zoning certificate for the construction of the pool; he believes there was also a fence permit that was given at the same time; we have a City code that requires a certain amount of fencing, although the City code does not require a fence in a no-build zone; we had a situation before where there was an application that the City had approved a fence that turns out to be in a no-build zone; recalls that the Commission was advised to honor that commitment. King replied that was his recollection. Peck asked King if it was his opinion that those circumstances are applicable here or do we need to do some more research. King replied that it's not the same situation because clearly there would have to be a fence permit for the pool; in the other situation, specifically the fence permit was issued for the actual no-build zone; don't know if that is the case here. Peck so we don't know exactly what the fence permit would have said back then. King replied that is correct. Turley commented so it wouldn't be a permit for the package, pool, and fence; asked do you have a copy of the permit for the pool. Breitenbach replied yes.

Breitenbach asked when a fence permit is issued, isn't the permit supposed to detail where the fence is to go. Peck replied that the compliance with the permit is almost always the responsibility of the person who is acting on the permit as opposed to the City. Breitenbach replied so there is no checkpoint to that. D'Ambrosio stated we do not do a checkpoint; the pool permit is issued by the Building department. Peck advised that the Building and Zoning departments are two different departments; the pool is built under one permit; the fence is installed on another; typically when the pool is built, the fence is not up. Breitenbach asked so you wouldn't allow one to happen without the other. Peck replied that once the pool is signed off from the Building Department, there is no further check in terms of the accuracy of the installation of the fence; it would just be a matter of people adhering to the application; the City would respond to complaints; the only other issue or distinction I would see with regard to a pool fence would be the height of the fence.

O'Hare commented to follow up on the question that Spencer addressed regarding the cost; doing some rough numbers, calculated the removal to make it in compliance is about 56 linear feet; then to put it into the correct place, it would be about 39 linear feet. Peck said so it could come into compliance without a variance. O'Hare replied that is correct. Turley asked do any of your contiguous neighbors have fences. Breitenbach replied no they do not; they have also told me they do not have any concerns or issues with this fence.

Peck commented to answer a question that you indirectly asked; how the Commission grants a variance is governed by Section 1131.03 - Advertised Public Hearing; for the Commission to grant a variance (a) there has to be special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application; (b) the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; and (c) the granting of the application will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injuries to property or improvements in such neighborhood; don't see any problem with section c of that 3 part analysis; the person who drives by your house is not going to see where this is because of the natural topography of the location of the lot and the amount of the dense woods behind it; in terms of a & b, the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; understand why you would prefer to leave

it the way it is; through no fault of your own, you've been handed a mess; don't see how moving the fence outside the no-build zone would be insurmountable.

O'Hare asked have you issued any type of complaint to the surveyor stating that you have a situation where something he should have shown on a more detailed mortgage survey was not shown. Breitenbach replied yes he has done that; the surveyor in fact indicated to me that the Planning Commission should seek a grandfathering clause because of the time factor. O'Hare stated so his mistake in surveying is supposed to be corrected by the Commission; the man has put a seal on this survey as well as his name on the line; he and even some of his descendents can be sued for things like this; apparently this survey does not meet what the Commission call minimum standards for a mortgage survey; my advice to you is to press home, because this is not correct for you.

Shepherd if your mortgage company would have known this they would not have allowed you to close; so his mistake allowed you to close on the property to begin with; your mortgage company would have reviewed the survey prior to producing a closing package for you.

Peck asked King if he felt comfortable that the prior granting of the zoning certificate and the pool permit doesn't obligate the Commission to approve a variance; in other words is this different enough from the prior situation where Weber issued that opinion; or is this something we have to look at. King replied he feels uncomfortable giving an off the cuff opinion based upon very little information; would like to look at what Weber did on the other application. Peck stated that this application will be taken to workshop for June 19th at 6:15 P.M.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:01 P.M.

Turley commented to D'Ambrosio on a prior application, the Zoning Department was able to look back at records and see whether or not a fence permit was acted on. D'Ambrosio stated that on the prior application we were able to find a log; on this application there is no log dating that far back; the records rule doesn't require we keep them back that far.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

V-0018-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1171.04(a)(12); 1171.04(a)(7) - Fence Standards; for property located at 338 Avonwick Place; to allow a decorative privacy fence to face property owner; by Gordon McKay, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02).

Chair advised that this application has been withdrawn.

Withdrawn

V-0019-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08(d) - Yard Requirements; for property located at 703 Turcotte Court; to allow for a six foot privacy fence in a no-build zone; by Debra & Jeffrey Hollenbach, applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02 and 6/26/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:03 P.M.

Jeffrey Hollenbach, 703 Turcotte, stated that the fence in the middle spot is to prevent the neighbor's dog from getting agitated.

Chair asked for Opponents.

Kice Stefanovski, 688 Tim Tam, stated that if I wanted sell my house next year, the

realtor is going to ask why did let your neighbor build a fence in no-build zone.

Canter asked can you accommodate what you need to do and still be outside the no-build zone. Hollenbach stated that the fence is basically used for a sight block so the Pit Bull doesn't see my children out playing and get agitated. Canter remarked that I'm sure you heard the lengthy discussion we had with the previous applicant about no-build zones; Chair Peck was very thorough with his discussion about what the Planning Commission has to have in place to grant variances; a Pit Bull really doesn't qualify for a special hardship here; a Pit Bull can move away tomorrow or die tomorrow, then we are stuck with a fence in a no-build zone. Hollenbach replied if the Pit Bull moved or demised tomorrow, then he would remove the fence. Turley asked have you considered using a row of evergreen shrubbery. Hollenbach replied yes he had, but by the time the shrubbery is full and grown his son will be in college. Peck asked Stefanovski if he understood that Hollenbach's desire to build a fence is to protect his children from your dog. Stefanovski stated that the dog is always tied and that children are playing in his yard. O'Hare stated that several children play in my yard and I haven't attacked one of them; don't think that your disposition is very neighborly of how you're treating the children. Peck indicated that he made a site visit last evening to take a look at this; believe that the way the house is situated on the lot and with the deck added to the back, it leaves a very short backyard; it's a subjective call as to whether putting a fence at the edge of the no-build zone would make it unusable; would think it would impair the use of the backyard; sympathetic to the safety concern that you've raised understanding that Stefanovski says that his dog is always tied; hesitant given the history of Pit Bulls. Stefanovski remarked that he will take his dog to his other house. Peck stated that if the dog can go to your other house, you can still enjoy your dog; that will eliminate the need for the fence. Stefanovski stated that he will move his dog immediately. Peck commented that the Commission will table this matter for two weeks; bring it back to Public Hearing on June 26th and see if a resolution has been worked out in the meantime.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:12 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

CU-0005-2002

To consider a Conditional Use application to allow a drive thru window; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N; by Canini & Pellecchia, Inc., Larry Canini, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:14 P.M.

Larry Canini, 430 Beecher Road, stated he is here to present the Crossing Center layout; would appreciate if the Planning Commission would consider the opportunity for him to review all three applications in one speech; would be happy to answer any questions regarding the Center this evening, to avoid having to do a workshop; this facility will be a continuation of the quality and the style of the roof lines, etc.; want to emphasize three critical issues, (1) the curb-cut on Beecher Road which we have discussed in past meetings; also most recently discussed with the Engineering Department regarding the design; in their discussions, the Engineers are satisfied with how we are proposing to secure only right-turn in and right-turn out operations; (2) the other issue is the drive-thru which relates to the right-turn in/right-turn out; again we think it is important for us to be able to provide that service to some of the particular users that we are entertaining right now; (3) one of the issues that I faced in designing this project when it came to the colors was making sure we were able to incorporate what we began as our basic element which was stone; to make sure that we were able to blend it with the brick facilities in the area (Schoedinger Funeral Home and the Fire House); the Center will have goose neck light fixtures; surface mounted hanging shingles.

Turley stated that her big concern is the east elevation; it looks like the back of a building; some buildings in that area are four sided; appreciate all that you have done with the brick and the stucco; architecturally it looks like the back of a building. Canini stated this is a major leap forward; this particular elevation is facing the back of Schoedinger Funeral Home which is primarily all their parking lot; they do have heavy shrubbery along that line; would say that the only thing that could really dress this up would be to do something along the roof line (i.e. providing dormers across the back); similar to what you see on the front. Spencer stated that he concurred with Turley; would like to see gable face particularly at the south end of the building; do not have a problem with the stucco. Canini remarked that we can do one of a number of things; we could do a combination of a couple of gables across the rear; or we could do a combination of a couple of gables with a couple of dormers between the gables. O'Hare asked where is the gas meter and the HVAC unit. Canini replied because these suites are of a smaller nature, we will be doing outside condenser units on the ground level in the rear instead of rooftop units; because again they're almost small residential units. O'Hare commented that after you go through all that effort of making it look decent thinks it spoils the effect of having a lot on the back side; asked are you going to screen the units. Canini replied he doesn't see a way to do this and yet it still be accessible to the service people; there is 23 ft. of pavement; will be coming in with the landscape plan separately; based on utility surveys recently conducted, the gas meters will end up on the north side and they will be on one manifold. O'Hare commented that sounds like an excellent idea; basically we are talking about the HVAC units and we can use some landscaping to hide the units.

Peck stated that this application will come back to Public Hearing on June 26th; request that Canini come back on the 26th at 6:45 P.M. with new elevation and landscape plans. Canini asked could we treat the air conditioner issue and landscape as part of the landscape plan that I will submit at a later date; therefore we can just concentrate on the roof line for the building. Peck replied that would be fine.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

FDP-0009-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Crossing Center; to allow for retail usage; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N.; by Canini & Pellecchia, Inc., Larry Canini, applicant. (Public Hearing Advertised in RFE on 6/6/02). (Public Hearing held on 6/12/02, 6/26/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0038-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 1050 Beecher Crossing N; by Canini & Pellecchia, Larry Canini, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

Z-0009-2002

To consider a zoning application on 21.353 acres of newly annexed property located East of Hamilton Road and South of Morse Road; contiguous to The Woods at Shagbark; requested zoning of L-AR; The Stonehenge Company, Mo Dioun by Smith & Hale, Glen A. Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:28 P.M.

Sherwood stated that this application was put on the agenda by mistake; the application has been re-advertised for two weeks; correction notices have been sent to the applicant and the contiguous property owners.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:29 P.M.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DR-0033-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 471 Morrison Road, Suite K; Revealty by Larry Schottenstein; Sign-A-Rama, Steve Thomson, applicant.

Chair read a letter from applicant requesting postponement until the June 26th meeting; also advised that applicant will meet will Planning Commission during Committee of the Whole at 6:45 P.M. on the 26th.

Postponed to Date Certain to Planning Commission

DR-0034-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 133 N. Hamilton Road; Wedding Gown Specialist by Advanced Screen Printing, Ken & Cindi Schillig, applicants.

Chair Peck commented that since there was no representative present, asked that this application be placed back on the agenda for the June 26th meeting.

Discussed

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0036-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 166 N. Hamilton Road; US Bank by DaNite Sign, Jill Waddell, applicant.

Tad Lamb stated he is here to request refacing on the signage currently there; refacing the two signs on the tower; the signs will be smaller; the sign above the front windows will not change in size; the drive-thru sign also will not change in size; the ATM sign will remain 12" x 12"; sign E6 is not included in this package (pertains to the ATM machine); another sign company will be handling its signage conversion.

A motion was made, seconded by Vice Chairman Turley, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 3 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley and O'Hare

Absent 1 Greenblott

DR-0037-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 1330 Stoneridge Drive; Taco Bell/Pizza Hut by Kessler Sign, Eric Laeuffer, applicant.

Eric Laeuffer, stated he is here to answer any questions the Commission might have regarding the sign; the actual monument sign will be smaller because of the refacing. Peck stated that he is pleased with this application packet. Laeuffer stated that they will be adding a small Pizza Hut sign to two of the three arches of the building. Peck stated in the staff comments it was suggested that the black background and white Pizza Hut lettering be reversed to white background with black letters. Laeuffer replied he didn't know if Pizza Hut which owned by Tricon would do that; will give it a shot.

A motion was made, seconded by Vice Chairman Turley, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 3 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley and O'Hare

Absent 1 Greenblott

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole - No Report

Gahanna Jefferson Joint Committee - Canter - No Report

Creekside Development Team - Greenblott - No Report

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney - No Report

City Engineer - No Report

Department of Development.

D'Ambrosio extended a verbal invitation for all to come to the Bar-B-Q Blues & Jazz Fest this weekend June 14th - 15th.

Chair.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.

SWP-0005-2002 To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.672 + .055 acres; for property located at 676 Brook Hollow; 4-M Partners, E.E. Maddy, applicant. (Approved administratively by Zoning Officer, Bonnie Gard on May 23, 2002).

SWP-0006-2002 To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.0011 acres; for property located at 1288 Totten Drive; Hoy Surveying Services, Inc., John Gallagher, applicant. (Approved administratively by Zoning Officer, Bonnie Gard on May 23, 2002).

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Canter apologized for the mishap last week; don't mind being yelled at by a resident, however, do not appreciate being yelled at by the applicant; will not walk out again from meeting.

Peck thanked the Administration for putting their heads together to clear the lines of communication; had a very contentious workshop meeting last week but the Administration has since sat down and pulled things together; again thank you to the Administration.

[2002-0026](#) To recommend to Council acceptance of park land in lieu of fees for the parkland dedication requirement of Section 1109.08 of the Codified Ordinances; Foxwood, Taylor Road.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Recommended to Council for Approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	3	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley and O'Hare
Absent	1	Greenblott

L. ADJOURNMENT. 8:40 P.M.

TANYA M. WORD
Deputy Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this
day of 2012.*

Chair Signature