



July 8, 2022

Schorr Architects, Inc.
230 Bradenton Ave.
Dublin, OH 43017

RE: Project 140-206 S Hamilton Rd, Final Development Plan

Dear Schorr Architects, Inc.:

The following comments were generated from the review of the submitted plans and documents for the referenced project. For the next submittal, please provide a response to comments, revised plans, and/or other information as requested for further review. The response to comments needs to include both the original comment and the appropriate response. If desired, these comments can be emailed. Re-submitted plans that do not include the disposition of comments document will not be reviewed and will be returned to you.

Planning

1. CH 1167.14(b) requires yards to be landscaped except when parking is permitted to encroach. Several areas of the site plan show drive aisles in the yard (setback areas). Drive aisles are permitted in the front yard to connect to right-of-way but they aren't permitted to be in required yards as these are to be landscaped and free of development. Drive aisles for parking lots have to meet the same setbacks as parking (36' front, 15' side/rear). Please revise the request accordingly or request a variance.

7/7/22 - A variance has been requested. See variance application for comments, if any.

2. What is meant by future parking? Is there a time frame for construction? Staff won't be able to sign off on occupancy permits for the building if all improvements on the FDP aren't constructed.
3. Informational Comment - Please be aware that no tree clearing or site work is permitted until the parameters of CH 1108.06(a) have been met.
4. Informational Comment - Please be aware that information is provided in the Planning Commission applications that is not approvable through this process. Additional applications such as sign permit, building permits, etc will be required.
5. CH 1167.19(b)(1) provides that any structure should be located and operated in such a manner that does not interfere with the enjoyment of adjacent land. Bleachers are located just 52' from residential properties. How can a 6,500 seat stadium operate in such a manner as to not produce noise levels that won't negatively impact adjacent properties? The code states that the noise at the shared property line should be at such a level as to not be perceptible over other development or above usual street level noise. Please address how this will be accomplished. Staff is off the opinion that the location of the stadium will create noise above and beyond what is typical of developments or street traffic and will thus negatively impact the surrounding neighborhoods.

7/8/22 - The noise study summary indicates that the new stadium location won't dramatically increase noise levels of surrounding properties. This resolves staff's comment. However, this issue will most likely be a point of conversation at forthcoming Planning Commission meeting(s).

6. The land use plan makes recommendations on development type, intensity, site layout, etc. Some recommendations to note include the following:

- Buildings should be located adjacent to r-o-w and parking should be located to the side and/or rear of the building. No parking or drive aisles should be located between the front of the building and r-o-w.

- Shared parking is encouraged.

- Parking should be fully screened from roadways.

- Structured parking is encouraged.

The site plan is not in conformance with any of the mentioned recommendations. Please revise the request to be more in line with the recommendations of the land use plan and/or provide reasoning for why the recommendations cannot be met. This is especially important in regards to parking since a variance is requested. This is also important since one of the primary goals of the land use plan was to recognize a shift from development patterns of the 70s, 80s, and 90s which were characterized by large building setbacks and parking lots along roadways. Instead the land use plan encourages buildings to be close to the street, parking to the rear, landscaping in front and side yards to soften development.

7/7/22 - Response to comments noted. As previously discussed and in this comment, the land use plan is a guide. Planning Commission has authority as to whether to require structured parking, setbacks, screening, etc. Please be aware that the staff report will include recommendations of the land use plan. At a minimum, staff will be recommending additional landscaping between the road and parking lot in an effort to screen parking areas. There appears to be ample area for additional trees and hedges.

Building

7. The project will be required to comply with the Ohio Building Code.

Parks

8. I am worried that plants inside the interior courtyard will struggle with limited sunlight. Arborvitae and ginkgo both prefer a decent amount of direct sunlight. More shade-tolerant plant species should be considered.

Norway maple should be replaced with another species. Norway maples are showing invasive tendencies and they are included on invasive watch lists in this region.

I would like to see planting specifications shown with the landscape plans.

Mulch should be pulled away from the trunks of trees to expose the root flare.

Plans show existing ash trees around the current tennis courts (adjacent to City Hall and Senior Center parking lot) to remain. These are the trees to the west and south of the proposed retention pond. These trees are in decline due to Emerald Ash Borer, and they should be removed as part of this project. New trees of a different species should be planted to replace them.

The species of proposed preserved trees must be listed in the landscape plans. I would like to see condition of the trees listed as well.

Location of protective fencing must be shown on plans.

9. As requested by GJPS staff, I inspected all trees along the school's eastern property line running adjacent to Savern Pl. By my count, there were 25 existing trees. Of those 25, I would recommend 9 for removal. These trees are marked with an orange dot on the west side of the trunk. These trees are recommended for removal based on canopy loss, structural defects such as splits and interior rot, or concerning insect activity. There were another 2 trees that should be considered for removal, but are not in poor condition currently. These 2 trees are marked with an orange dot in the grass on the west side of the tree. There is one mature sycamore with a trunk cavity and a pine. The sycamore has a healthy canopy, but the trunk cavity could be affecting the structural integrity of the tree. A second opinion by an ISA Certified Arborist should be considered for this tree. The pine appears to be in the early stages of a fungal disease, and although it has a full canopy at this time, I believe it will begin to brown out soon. There were an additional 14 trees that appear to be in good condition, and these trees were not marked.

My last comment about the existing ash trees around the proposed stormwater basin was not addressed. These trees have been impacted by the Emerald Ash Borer, and many of them have already begun to decline. I do not believe that these trees can withstand the stresses that will come with construction such as torn roots, compaction, and other mechanical damage. These trees should be removed and replaced with a different species.

Fire District

10. It was made clear that this is a design review and final development plans. The fire division has no objection as to the design review or variance for Lincoln High School. We realize these are speculative drawings and designs, although demolition of the old elementary, relocation of the football field, sitework, construction starting soon has an effect on responses to this area and is a cause for concern.

Development Engineer

11. A final engineering plan review will be required following approval of the Final Development Plan (FDP). Engineering plan review can be concurrent with the FDP process if requested. Concurrent review may expedite the project.
12. Traffic Impact Study: 1. Please provide the Synchro files utilized for the analysis to supplement the review.
13. Traffic Impact Study: 2. Please provide signal timing outputs for all signalized capacity analyses.
14. Traffic Impact Study: 3. [Page 5-1] The recommended westbound left turn lane at Havens Corners Road & Western School Access is stated as 150'. However, calculations according to ODOT L&D seem to show that the turn lane only needs to be 100'. It is unclear if the length was increased due to queuing, as the queuing analysis was not provided for the intersection.
15. Traffic Impact Study: 4. [Typical for all capacity analysis] Per the OATS manual, peak hour factors should be applied for the entire intersection, rather than per individual movement, unless otherwise

advised by the City of Gahanna. However, due to the timing nature of school generated traffic, the methods used in the TIS are acceptable.

16. Traffic Impact Study: [Typical for all capacity analysis] The study utilizes default heavy vehicle percentage of 2% in all cases except for turning movements in and out of school access points. CM supports this approach.
17. Traffic Impact Study: 6. [Figures 3A, 4A, 4B] The west leg of the Hamilton Road & Gatsby's Access intersection is not shown on the volume sheets, even though volumes do enter/exit that leg in either the arrival or dismissal peak.
18. Traffic Impact Study: 7. Synchro outputs for the 2024 No Build scenarios seem to have been printed with an incorrect title of "2021 Existing Traffic Volumes"
19. Traffic Impact Study: 8. [2044 – No-Build Traffic Volumes – Arrival Peak Synchro Output] Incorrect volumes are entered for the northbound approach, though this is unlikely to affect capacity results.
20. Traffic Impact Study: 9. [2044 – No-Build Traffic Volumes – Dismissal Peak Synchro Output] Incorrect volumes are entered for the northbound approach, though this is unlikely to affect capacity results.
21. Traffic Impact Study: 10. [2044 – Build Traffic Volumes – Arrival Peak Synchro Output] Westbound right volume should be 92 instead of 82. However, this is unlikely to majorly affect capacity results.
22. Traffic Impact Study: 11. Volume sheets for the Gary Lee Excluded scenarios don't seem to be provided within the TIS.
23. Traffic Impact Study: 12. [Page 5-5] Remove "reconstruct" from the first sentence of the second paragraph.
24. Traffic Impact Study: 13. Capacity deficiencies at for the split-phased operation of Hamilton Road & Gary Lee Drive/North School Access could be mitigated by aligning the North School Access to Gary Lee Drive and utilizing standard NEMA phasing for the signal. Please provide analysis of this intersection configuration in the revised study.
25. Traffic Impact Study: 14. There is confusion regarding the proposed location of the West School access on Havens Corners Road per Figure 2A. Please clarify the access location is intended to be aligned with Oak Creek place on the north side of Havens Corners Road as provided in previous submittals to the City of Gahanna.
26. Traffic Impact Study: 15. CM supports the recommendation to install a 300' eastbound right turn lane at the West access along Havens Corners Road. At this location, there are two eastbound through lanes that merge into one. Due to the dual southbound left turn lanes at the Hamilton/Havens Corners signal, it is recommended that the merge lane remain as to not create lane utilization issues at the signal and not create a drop-right turn lane. We recommend the right turn lane be installed using new pavement / road width. However, this should be discussed further with the City.
27. Traffic Impact Study: 16. There are concerns regarding the southbound left turn movements at the Hamilton Road & North School Access intersection and potential southbound through volume queue blockage. Assuming the dual northbound left turn lanes at Hamilton/Havens Corners are not reduced, there is only about 60' of storage space for left turn queues into the school (120 total feet if including both proposed left turn lanes). The

July 8, 2022

Re: Project 140-206 S Hamilton Rd,
140 S Hamilton Rd,

queuing analysis in the TIS shows queue lengths that will exceed that distance.
Please provide mitigation recommendations.

28. Traffic Impact Study: 17. Please confirm or verify that there is sufficient left turn lane storage distance between Gary Lee Drive and the South School Access along Hamilton Road. The TIS addresses left turn lane storage needs for the South School Access. However, northbound left turns to Gary Lee Drive will need to be maintained.
29. Traffic Impact Study: 18. Due to the proximity of the internal east/west cross street immediately south of Havens Corners Road, it is recommended that proper signage be placed on site to ensure entering vehicles at the West and East site access points are not blocked by queued vehicles exiting the school at either access point. CM recommends stop-control on the eastbound, westbound, and (if applicable) northbound approaches of these internal intersections with southbound traffic unrestricted.
30. Traffic Impact Study: 19. It may be necessary to restrict left turn egress at the South School Access on Hamilton Road due to LOS/delay deficiencies. The TIS indicates that left turn egress at this access will be limited to staff only. Please provide analysis of this intersection with left turn egress restricted and redirect left turning vehicles to the signal at the North School Access. Additionally, please evaluate the North School Access with these additional outbound left turn vehicles to determine impacts of the restriction of the South School Access.
31. Traffic Impact Study: 20. Additional comments may be provided after reviewing the Synchro files and signal timing outputs.
32. Utility plan has been included with second submission. Planning Commission-level review of utilities awaiting requested calculations.
33. Traffic Impact Study's second submission is currently in review. Comments will be provided separately once available.
34. Engineering plans (including sanitary sewer calculations) are under review. Comments will be provided separately once available.

If you have any comments or questions, please contact me at kelly.wicker@gahanna.gov or (614) 342-4025.

Sincerely,

Kelly Wicker
Planning and Zoning Coordinator