

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 14, 2000

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

*David B. Thom, Chairman
Candace Greenblott, Vice Chairman
Cynthia G. Canter, Commission Member
Paul J. Mullin, Commission Member
Richard A. Peck, Commission Member
Phillip B. Smith, Commission Member
Jane Turley, Commission Member
Isobel L. Sherwood, Clerk*

Members Present: Phillip B. Smith, Paul J. Mullin, Richard Peck, Cynthia G. Canter and David B. Thom

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio, on Wednesday, June 14, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on June 9, 2000. Chair David B. Thom called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Deputy Clerk of Council Isobel Sherwood.

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.

Chair moved CU-0009-2000 and V-0014-2000 to the end of the application area of the agenda to follow Z-0010-2000.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 24, 2000

MOTION by Canter, seconded by Peck, to approve the minutes of May 24, 2000.
ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Canter, Peck, Greenblott, Thom, Turley, Mullin, Smith.
Motion carried.

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: None.

E. APPLICATIONS:

Chair stated Public hearing Rules that would govern hearings this evening. Planning Commission Member, Richard Peck, administered an oath to those persons wishing to present testimony this evening.

FDP-0002-2000

FDP-02-00 To consider a final development plan to allow the construction of 3 buildings for property located at 960, 988 and 1020 Claycraft Road; John Ingwersen, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 3/02/00)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m.

John Ingwersen, 1050 Bryden Road, have been in concert with the staff and through several meetings with Planning Commission on development of this property by my client Larry Greenberg; build three office warehouse buildings that in sum total are 60,000 SF; will be 1 story, non combustible construction; have discussed access to the site, landscaping, scale of the buildings, and breaking up with appropriate landscaping; at last workshop discussed willingness to add additional plantings to break up white facade; new plan shows columnar maples across front of the building; do have amended landscape plan for the record showing location of those; are 6 of these trees per building; each building is a 24,000 sf structure; proportional 2 maples on smaller structure; respectfully submit these plans; feel we are complying with all wishes of Planning Commission and feel it will be a great addition an is aesthetically pleasing.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Greenblott asked if signage is in this package; Ingwersen stated it was not included in this package; only signage on buildings will be street numbers; will go through signage for approval at a later date.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m.

Canter stated this has been discussed in workshop most recently last week; as stated has complied with our requests from workshop to add columnar maples which appears on amended landscape plan; final development plan meets code requirements of 1108.01 and 1108.05; other concern was master plan of area and Development Department did review with us at workshop.

A motion was made by Canter that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

DR-0013-2000

DR-13-00 Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of 3 office buildings.

Canter noted approval of this was based on the amended landscape plan submitted this evening. See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made by Canter that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

FDP-0007-2000

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office warehouse facility; for property located at 1278 Research Road; RPA Leasing by Segna Associates, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 5/18/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Ken Garrett, Segna Associates, 781 Northwest Blvd., Columbus, stated this project is for warehouse at rear of RPA site; is an addition of 6,000 sf total to house materials for the owner as well as a couple of company vehicles.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Peck asked Garrett regarding the front facing of this building; is the front going to be architectural block to match the main structure. Garrett stated it was. Peck stated that although not in the purview of this application would like to know about the surfacing of parking lot. Garrett stated that owner is entertaining do it; not sure it is scheduled. D'Ambrosio stated it is on the code enforcement list to keep eye on the lot; will make sure it does get paved or patched; is more of a code enforcement issue.

Canter questioned the color. Garrett stated the color has been switched back to the lighter color submitted.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:17 p.m.

A motion was made by Mullin that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

DR-0032-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of a new warehouse for storage of materials and company vehicles; for property located at 1278 Research Road; RPA Leasing, Inc. applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made by Mullin that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

FDP-0008-2000

To consider a final development plan application for the construction of two office buildings; for property located at 680-730 Taylor Road; The Daimler Group, Inc., applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE 5/18/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Todd Sloan, Daimler Group, 1533 Lake Shore Blvd., stated he was present representing the applicant; from word I got regarding workshop there is still some question on detailing on outside of the building; do have photograph and locations we talked about; building has a couple of bands that run across it; photo is taken from a similar distance situation from where we are; corbeling is combined with a couple of other features. Sloan continued that if we look from aerial view; curved walls face each other; even on back side added some detail on that; didn't want to get a long linear building in any direction; have done several things to break up facade; put the drivit and glass section into smaller 35' segments to make them smaller; although not evident on this drawing, limestone keys on top and middle band; corbel in band that goes around top; finally to add detail have headers above all windows; soldier course brick also; more detail on this facade than any other building we've done in Gahanna; trying to downsize the look of the buildings; wasn't here last week; we have gone to great lengths; to go ; done a lot to achieve that goal; only question raised;

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Mullin stated he didn't have a problem with the brick detailing as presented as long as commission is satisfied that it is acceptable; is very subtle; is not something you will see from street but will become aware of as you approach the buildings; one of the buildings pointed out to the Commission as an example was the Ohio School Boards on N High St; as you drive by on High Street it looks like a flat brick facade with windows punched; when you get back to first row of parking you can pick up some of the brick soldier course and corbel solidier coursing that is part of the design; only comment is that we are dealing with the same material as wall surfaces and detailing will be very subtle; as a Commission, if you are expecting the horizontals and recesses above windows to be seen from a distance, it won't happen.

Peck stated he echoed Mullin's concern; saw the building at Watermark and drove to Polaris; notice that OSBA had limestone headers over windows; but by and large agree that although it was a different detail it was not visible; got to Watermark at 6:00 and had to get out of the car to see it; it is subtle but compared with composite I see that on balance it and would not oppose. Sloan stated they had thought about limestone headers but can't afford to do that with other detailing we are adding; would need to redo the skin somehow to bring down the cost; is expensive; OSBA is cast stone not limestone; in smaller quantities limestone can be cheaper; but is about 5 to 6 times more expensive than the brick.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m.

Smith noted that in workshop did discuss rooftop features and that screening will be of sufficient height to block mechanicals; talked about noise; due to screening most of the noise will project up and away from residential areas.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Peck stated he did intend to support mindful of the fact that Limited Overlay has gone to Council and has been approved; still, in my view, are guided by the master plan; this is a

transition area; spent some time this afternoon reviewing this; couple of significant features about this project need to comment on; one is square footage of this building and blacktop notwithstanding the massive size; this is a 330,000 sf lot that is only 54% covered; about half is still in green space; secondly developer has far exceeded minimum requirements; on this plan saw 264 trees and 85 shrubs; some are existing and some are added; 51 red maples were added in parking lot; developer has moved footprint forward so back edge of building is 289' from property line and approximately 350' from rear of adjoining houses on Hunters Run; HVAC has been designed to keep noise down and did an alternate design to do that; compared most significantly footprint to the project next to it which was condominium; this is far less dense and goes a long way to seeing the master plan of providing a transition area incorporated; also enhanced by landscape on east and west; is a boulevard entry; along frontage most adjacent to Hunters Ridge residents there are significant amounts of landscaping; developer has gone a long way to achieving a successful project and City's goal of reasonable transition of further intense use down Morrison Road and existing residential further down Taylor.

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Mullin, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

DR-0033-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of two office buildings; for property located at 680-730 Taylor Road; The Daimler Group, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Mullin, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

FDP-0009-2000

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of a warehouse building; for property located at 715 Science Blvd; John Ingwersen by Columbus Consulting, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

John Ingwersen, 1050 Bryden Road, stated this was a 1.5 acre site that sits to the west directly in front of bus garage on Science; this is a 10,000 sf building on a beautiful site overlooking a golf course practice range if things go well; may be that rear facade will take advantage of that view; look forward to workshop discussion around how this site develops; geography to the rear is the diversion ditch as it drops from Science down to cutoff in Bedford Landfill; this particular building was in fact for the tenant that Greenberg has secured for the 1020 Claycraft building; was not sure we would get approval for that but business was committed to Gahanna; elevations for this building show enough dock doors to support the Entenman project; would propose discussion in workshop that may have a different need for dock doors as they become a prominent feature from roadway; have attempted to screen but good discussion for next week.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed public hearing at 7:39 pm.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop on June 21 at 6:15 p.m. Canter asked Development Department to bring the overall site plan for the area for placement of this in total scheme.

DR-0037-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a warehouse building.

See discussion on previous application.

FDP-0010-2000

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office building; for property at Taylor Station Road and Cross Pointe Road, Crossroads Commerce Center; Donald Kenney by Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Richard Fisher, Collaborative Design, 5880 Sawmill Road, Dublin, stated we are dealing with a drivit stucco finish building on 2.6 acres; lighter color is base color and darker color is the reveal; do have color swatches; base of the building will be concrete foundation up to window sill painted out in base color; blue tint glass and parex finish.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Canter asked if we were getting a revised site plan to meet code requirements. Fisher stated he felt they had submitted one; will get site plan in time for workshop.

In response to question, Fisher stated this building is all Class B office space with no warehouse.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Chair assigned to workshop at 6:30 p.m. on June 21.

DR-0038-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of an office building.

See discussion on previous application.

FDP-0011-2000

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of an office building; for property located at 1200 Technology Drive; John Ingwersen by Columbus Consulting, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:45 p.m.

John Ingwersen, 1050 Bryden Road, stated he was present representing the applicant; this is for Best Courier; is an amendment to a previously approved FDP and DR; between approval and getting to this point client decided he needed a bonded warehouse which added 3,000 sf to the building; also necessitates an addition of 6 parking spaces and a very slight modification to building elevations; are new requirements for parking and tree planting on site; will get them off Mill Street and into this office park area.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Canter noted that this application amended FDP-23-99.

A motion was made by Canter that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

DR-0040-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of an office building.

Canter noted this application amended DR-94-99. See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made by Canter that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

Z-0009-2000

To consider a zoning change application to rezone 3.546 acres from ER-1 to ER-2 for property located at 94 Price Road; City of Gahanna Development Department, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:48 p.m.

Jennifer D'Ambrosio, Deputy Director of Development, stated they were requesting recommendation of this change to zoning for 3.548 acres currently zoned ER-1; this Commission recently approved a lot split application; the remaining 18 acres will be owned by the City for park and possibly a wetland bank; the 3.5 acres has a residence on it; asking change from ER-1 to ER-2 to meet code requirements as the remaining parcel is no longer a minimum of 5 acres; same requirements otherwise.

Chair asked for opponents. Curtis Krivit, 72 Price Road, stated he lived next door; what plans do you have for the property. Thom stated it would be parkland and possibly used for wetland remediation. D'Ambrosio stated it will remain parkland as 90% is in flood plain. Krivit stated that no one has lived in the resident for 1-1/2 years; concerned with vandalism. D'Ambrosio stated that Helman confirmed that someone in his family will live there.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:50 p.m.

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

Yes 5 Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

Z-0010-2000

To consider a zoning change application to rezone 32.952 acres from ER-1 to L-AR, Limited Overlay Apartment Residential; for property located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., by Glen Dugger, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:52 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Oh 43215, stated he was presenting representing Triangle Real Estate Services, the contract purchasers of the property; is 30.3 acres on south side of Morse Road, east of Polo Club; to the north is Morse Road; east is Lynn Mann property with large lake; south is a number of large lots fronting on US 62; to the west is Polo Club; this site does wrap around 2 properties - 5069 owned by New Albany Company and other property is owned by Vic Stanson; have been in contact with those individual owners; this request is to rezone from ER to limited AR; contains a number of components; there are essentially 3 AR uses as part of this; in western central area there is approximately 76 ranch condominiums; they are 1 and 1-1/2 story buildings arranged in 4 unit buildings; the large building at the northeast corner is an age restricted apartment building; at southern end are up to 208 apartments; feel this accommodates some of the various issues raised regarding this property; in addition there are 2 components concerning open space; Beem Ditch starts on this property and bisects from the northeast to the southwest and will be dedicated to City as parkland; are 2 small wetlands in that area; if there is a scenic part of this property that deserves preservation that would be it; 2.6 acre tract is part of the Evans ownership and it goes out to Johnstown Road; City has indicated interest in acquiring that as part of their open

space; in the north triangle are we worked through a prior proposal as well and worked with Commission on multi family zonings in other parts of the City; fairly familiar and in touch with as many bases as we could; briefly go through why I think this proposal complies with the North Triangle Plan and point out a number of elements; North Triangle Plan asks us to aggregate property; we have 32 acres in 7 different parcels including the large horse farm known as Underwood Stables; was strong discussion by some members of this Commission to want to include that in the prior proposal; by obtaining this land the entrance feature lines up with the Preserve to the north; we are coordinating access points; does comply with the plans requested desire for corridor setback along Morse Road; age restricted units are away from center line about 200' and requirement is 150'; apartment buildings also meet that setback; preservation of the south side in open space as has been recommended; other thing the plan talks about is access to the interior; have set aside a 30' strip along the south side for an east west Riva Ridge connector if that would ever get build; land will be available to the City if that plan ever goes forward; would be our fair share contribution; have strived for coordination amongst parcels for access to major streets and discourage that each parcel have access; we have 1000' feet of frontage from east to west with 2 access points, excluding New Albany Company and Stanson; there is one to the west and the boulevard entrance on the Underwood Farms site; have indicated to staff, Stanson, and New Albany Company that we will extend access to both of those properties by easement so that at such time as those properties would be developed they could have access through our development; trying to create controlled access along Morse Road; indicated that in writing to Stanson and will work that out; key component to this concerns use; North Triangle Plan identifies this area as office and mixed development which includes single family and higher density residential; are matching up the existing use of Polo Club with a very similar ranch condo format immediately to its east; the highest density are the age restricted units and most intense component; feel we matched up fairly well with the activity and anticipated land uses that will occur as well as having followed recommendation of the plan concerning open space; plan we presented recommends that the Beem Ditch be preserved in its natural state; set that aside and the element contained in the North Triangle Plan and this plan matches up well; all of those things are instances that I think match; tried to do our homework in bringing this to you; have done some things that we thought might be of issue; have prepared a traffic study; was submitted to City and reviewed and approved; met with City Traffic Engineer, City Engineer; and County Engineer on coordination of widening of Morse Road to accommodate development on north and south sides; was a concern that with differing jurisdictions there would be different requirements upon the developers; not working at cross purposes; have an ongoing relationship with Polo Club; will be meeting with them Monday night; primary issue we had unresolved with prior application was building height issues and were working through that; immediate solution is that buildings are 1-1/2 story ranch condominiums; essentially one story form with 1/2 story as an option; building lines reflect that should they choose to finish the half story above; that matches up better than previous proposals; were criticized previously concerning the ownership form; this current proposal is split between ranch and age restricted plus apartments; have in excess of 50% owner occupied; feel this is a step forward in the right direction; absentee ownership was an issue in some people's minds.

Mark DiSabato, Triangle Real Estate Services, stated we would defer to questions and will be at workshop; begin a new relationship; glad to answer any questions.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Turley asked if examples of the architecture were available. Dugger stated that conceptual drawings were submitted and have been concerned with review of those; we

have those for you to look at; my understanding is that we were not to get too heavily into that issue at this point. Turley stated we need to discuss in workshop how detailed we want to get. Dugger stated that staff has indicated to us that it would be appropriate to decide at a later time.

Greenblott asked Dugger if she could get some clarity on what the possible usage of the cut out areas might be. Dugger stated that he has known Stanson for 8 years; have worked closely in bringing much of the north triangle into the city; very strong advocate for the annexation of his property and many of the others; have represented New Albany Company; there is no malice but just that Stanson is happy in his home; his view of the value of the property did not allow for it to be included; my view has always been that those two would be jointly developed; New Albany Company has agreed to be flexible when Stanson is ready to move; this is one of those difficult issues regarding the north triangle plan; there is a 150' setback on a fairly small piece of property which makes about 1/3 not usable; that would be a significant hardship; always viewed these properties as a small office site if they were not drawn into a larger parcel.

Turley stated also for discussion at workshop is the outparcel dedicated as parkland; how that would be utilized; how it would benefit the residents; referring to the Johnstown Road parcel.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop at 6:50 p.m. on June 21.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

CU-0009-2000

To allow a modular unit for classroom space in a residential area; property located at 795 Havens Corners Road, St. Matthew School.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:11 p.m.

Patty Thom, 511 Haversham Drive, stated she was requesting allowance of a modular unit to be located at St. Matthew for classroom use.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Greenblott asked why St. Matthew could not make this a permanent building. P. Thom stated it was being paid for by the State Department of Education; paid with state funds; same program as in public schools to have LD and speech classes; they cannot be associated with St. Matthew. Greenblott asked why the State can't make this a permanent building. P. Thom stated the State cannot use public monies to build on private property for private schools.

In response to question from Smith on color, P. Thom stated it will match school; either brown or beige, whichever would blend in best; not the grey in the picture. Greenblott do we have sufficient landscaping. P. Thom stated that landscaping behind where mobile classrooms were located will stay and will put additional landscaping as needed or required.

Peck asked if we are required to notify property owners immediately behind the site. Clerk stated we are not required to notify on a conditional use.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Smith stated this is a conditional use and one thing we have been doing consistently, like with Evangel and Shepherd, has been timing these; not that we expect any miraculous building; modulars, with no disrespect to GE, tend to fall apart; don't we always time these. Canter stated that the stipulation made at the time of those applications was that their intent was to build; intent here is never to build due to state law. Smith stated that as long as that distinction is on record he is satisfied.

Peck stated he is not a big fan of modulars; if it's important enough to teach, it ought to be in a permanent structure for several reasons including safety; do understand unique concerns that the constitution places on public funding of parochial schools; am not a big proponent but do understand the constitutional reasons and those outweigh my hesitancy and distaste for these buildings.

Canter stated she has been a vocal opponent to modular units but understand there is no recourse; will support.

Mullin asked if this was strictly a conditional use and actual location is not part of the conditional use. Thom stated the actual location is shown on site plan. Mullin stated he felt there are some serious safety issues with the location; the service drive accesses right on to the area; feel this is a safety concern; if site location is part of the conditional use that is one issue but if not part of the conditional use that becomes another issue.

Peck stated that 1169.02(b)(2) says that size and location is part of the conditional use; think if there is a concern it needs to be addressed. Mullin stated that the site plan shows a service drive extending to the east directly in front of this unit; clearly shows the individual access out of the spaces as emptying into the service drive with only protection being 6 bollards; not concerned about the building being hit by a moving vehicle but about individual children and adults leaving the building.

Peck stated that experience from this location is that during operation hours there is a chain that would be at the northwest corner between school and convent to the west to prohibit vehicular traffic during school hours.

Tim Decker stated that there is a chain that blocks off the area; is a play area with no traffic back there; no deliveries are made back past this building; maintenance may need to occasionally get back there. Mullin stated it says it is a service drive. Decker stated there is 21' between modular and permanent building; bollards sit out 2' so there is about 19' for emergency purposes.

A motion was made by Canter that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Yes** **3** Smith, Peck and Canter
- No** **1** Mullin
- Abstain, COI** **1** Chairman Thom

V-0014-2000

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1167.18c(1), Screening of Trash Containers or Receptacles, to permit dumpster in front of building, 184 W. Johnstown Road; Ed Hanawalt, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:25 p.m.

Ed Hanawalt, 582 Wickham Way, stated he was requesting permission to have his dumpster in front of the building; can't put at rear of building as there is no access; am landlocked.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public hearing at 8:26 p.m.

Mullin asked what are we doing; don't have enough information to make a decision; take it to workshop; not prepared to vote on it tonight.

In response to question, D'Ambrosio stated we will have materials list and what the dumpster enclosure would look like; will have that; he is using like materials so it can be approved by Zoning Administrator; has given us a proposed location; then we determine that his materials are acceptable; if it meets code as to screening and landscaping then it can be approved without coming back to you; request is for variance for location. Mullin stated he would still like to take it to workshop.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop on June 21 at 7:20 p.m.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0035-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 360 S. Hamilton Road; Cal Berkey, applicant.

Scott Rahl, Marathon Oil, Fisher Road, Columbus, stated he was speaking on behalf of Berkey; submitted some plans at workshop; have amended those shortening the amount of blue, rearranging the graphics to say Marathon instead of food center; also have rendering of new sign; important point is that the sign will not be any higher than existing sign; only increase in square footage is car wash ID panel; there is a car wash panel on existing Shell sign; glad to answer any questions.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Mullin verified that we were talking about the sign with the car wash panel.

Turley stated she can't support for a couple of reasons; do like the darker blue; can't support an increase of almost 40 s.f. in signage; would prefer to see a more subdued canopy coloration.

Canter stated she is not opposed to the canopy but the 30 s.f. additional on ground mounted sign; is a busy and dangerous intersection; would like to see something smaller not an increase; would not be opposed to decrease in signage; blue has softened the impact from the yellow but can't support the package.

A motion was made by Smith that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	4	Smith, Mullin, Peck and Chairman Thom
No	1	Canter

DR-0036-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a free standing, single face sign mounted to existing fence; property located at the corner of Cherry Bottom Road and Cherry Way Drive; Charles Penzone by The New Albany Company.

Mike Crommes, Landscape Architect, New Albany Company, 6525 West Campus Oval, New Albany, stated he was present representing Charles Penzone Co ; was here in 1995 when we had sign on Morse Road; New Albany Company owned the outparcel and once

it was sold it became an off premise sign; are now requesting a new sign at northwest corner of Cherrybottom Road and Cherry Way; there is an existing doctor's sign across on the southwest corner; latest revision shows that colors have been modified; there is a slight modification in general size; the size submitted was 56" by same dimension to a sign that is 4' tall by 8' long; sign is located 2' behind right of way; fence will be stepped back to about 25' and allow us to float a free standing sign at 15' outside the right of way; overall height would be less than 5-1/2'; proposing a 15' by 25' landscape bed to tie the fence and sign together; will add ground cover and do spring flowering cover in bed.

Peck questioned statement that fence would move back; is no longer integrated with fence. Crommes stated the sign would be freestanding; fence would move; did look at putting it on fence but did not feel that was image we wanted to portray; was not a nice detail; typically have done this at intersections through our development; there are utility easements; there is an existing sidewalk system at corner now.

Turley questioned the illumination. Crommes stated it would be ground mounted flood so they can wash the sign and only the sign. In response to question, Crommes stated the fence is over 40' from actual building now; are a number of window wells on that elevation; with landscaping they have will still meet all the setbacks; stepping the fence will help visibility with southbound traffic; will provide better visibility of the sign; there should still be about 20' and will terminate with an 8' x 8' post; will be in line with street trees that have been put back; feel it is a logical connection; is something similar to what was on Morse Road where the original sign was; a green space corridor exists on Cherrybottom as well; will be additional landscaping.

Greenblott stated she would request we refer this to workshop so we can have a chance to go out and take a look at the area and existing signage; see what is going up; there is a building mounted sign on that facade. Crommes stated he was still under the code requirements. Peck echoed the request; was prepared to oppose as did not want to see any signage on that horse fence as we would then have a series of signs in here for approval; although this is a quality operation, what we do for one may be setting a precedent we don't want to set; because this application has changed significantly from what was presented in packet ask that this go to workshop.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop on June 21 at 7:30 p.m.

DR-0039-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness for Sign installed without permit M & S Inc.; 345 Granville Street; Debbie Smith by Frank Zura/Sign-a-Rama.

Frank Zura, 64 Granville St., stated he was requesting approval of this sign. Greenblott asked if sign had been taken down at all; is this a new application; if we denied first application why is sign still up. D'Ambrosio stated that applicant came in and made another application; as long as application is pending we can't cite. Greenblott asked if it was the same sign. D'Ambrosio stated it was.

Peck asked if anything had been done to color match on top. Zura stated it was a standard aluminum color that they tried to match; bottom three panels look different than the others; top was painted like others; new panels are aluminum strips 12" by 46" and you can't match exactly. Greenblott stated that was our concern; also not sure we wanted tenant panels and yet you put them up; can't do this; willing to take to workshop for further discussion; thought we told you we didn't like this sign by turning it down; you resubmitted without making any changes. D'Ambrosio stated Zura was told to resubmit by Development Department in hopes of going to workshop and coming to a resolution; Zura is more than willing to work with Commission; needed a starting point.

Mullin stated that from comments made thus far seems clear that one of the key issues is

matching colors across the sign; this is going to have to be addressed. Zura stated that whatever is required will be met.

Zura stated that if sign panels are not allowed there are approximately 10 to 20 panels in City but there is nothing in requirements that say you don't want or can't have; look at the sign code and we say it can be done; is only fair to put requirements in code; how is a company or individual to know if it isn't in code.

Smith stated it might be time to see if it flies; is an excellent suggestion; not that we haven't sent the sign code up a couple of times; but with changes in membership maybe we haven't expressed our concerns strongly enough.

Turley stated a lot of things aren't in code as to design review. Zura stated that panels are a structural issue not an aesthetic issue; they are so prominent in society; investors in your town that will take and parcel out pieces; understand that it is extremely expensive anymore to take a sign and completely redo; can paint it or put vinyl on and pull off easily a year or two later; some of the signs around now have different colors and nobody is policing; there's one on Granville Street that changed out to blue and silver on a brown strip sign; this sign issue is an issue of two things; first being strip panels and secondly of not getting a permit; when it started out, it was to be exact same; client changed mind in middle of process; that's my fault for not following through.

Peck stated he understood frustration and share your concerns; have had many conversations on code enforcement; that is a separate issue; would love to address brown sign; that sign was installed long before this sign code was constituted; but recent change to the panel has been brought to City's attention.

HOP-0002-2000

To consider a Home Occupation Permit to allow for a mail order candle and supply business thru Internet; 463 Old Mill Drive, Herbert Schaeffer, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair stated that applicant requested postponement to next meeting due to illness in the family.

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS: None

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

Director of Development.

D'Ambrosio Invited members to Relay for Life to be held Friday night at Middle School West; event runs from 6:00 p.m. on Friday night to noon Saturday.

Chair.

Chair stated that Peck's comments on Limited Overlay was sent to Council; they have stated they would like to have a special meeting and would like to do that on a Saturday; will pick out a couple of Saturdays in August and try to get a consensus.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Turley stated she didn't know if we can change course in mid stream in accepting applications; have another Limited Overlay before us now. Peck asked if there was any guidance from Council. Thom stated from his discussion with White that the memo was well received; in support of it just want to discuss it further; think we are heading in the

right direction; follow our general guidelines that we have followed in the past. Canter stated we need to follow code until Council makes a decision on what they want to do.

Greenblott stated that signage is making me nuts; submissions are so far over what we have been allowing by square footage; understand they are not over by code. Mullin stated we can't arbitrarily make a number limitation and expect them to hold up; was approved as it is within code. Greenblott stated there is design review; need guidelines for directory signs; we are not being consistent in turning down some; still feel we can discourage them.

L. ADJOURNMENT: 9:05 p.m.

MOTION by Smith, seconded by Greenblott.

*

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC
Deputy Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

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

Chair Signature