



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Donald R. Shepherd, Chair

David Andrews, Vice Chair

Joseph Keehner

Jennifer T. Price

Kristin Rosan

David B. Thom

Thomas J. Wester

Donna L. Jernigan, MMC, Senior Deputy Clerk of Council

Wednesday, March 13, 2013

7:00 PM

City Hall

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, March 13, 2013. Chair Don Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission Member Andrews.

Present 4 - David B. Thom, David K. Andrews, Jennifer Tisone Price, and Joe Keehner

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.

A motion was made by Rosan, seconded by Thom, to add DR-0009-2013 to the agenda under NEW BUSINESS. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting February 27, 2013.

A motion was made by Rosan, seconded by Price, to approve the minutes of the February 27, 2013 Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA.

E. APPLICATIONS/PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chair read the rules that would govern tonight's public hearings. Assistant City Attorney Tom Weber gave an oath to those persons wishing to address the Commission.

[V-0003-2013](#)

Gard said the application is as stated by the Chair; this is the second appearance for the applicant; the last public hearing mediation between the two neighbors was

discussed and that has been accomplished by City Attorney Ewald I believe; that is not why we are here tonight; request is to allow the vertical support members to remain where they are on the existing fence.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m., and asked for proponents.

Linda Snyder, 172 Andalus Dr., said we have an agreement and I am fine with it; we have until May 12, 2013 to fix the fence and then to allow the vertical posts to stay and we will finish off his side of the fence.

Chair asked for opponents.

Jeff Perry, attorney for Charles Norris, said we have an agreement and we have copies signed by Mr. Norris; we just need Mrs. Snyder to sign; we have nothing more.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

A motion was made by Thom, seconded by Andrews, to approve V-0003-2013 to allow a fence to be constructed with the supporting members facing the neighboring property and that the vertical members will remain as is. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[FDP-0003-2013](#)

Gard said this is the second time for this application at public hearing; did discuss at workshop and all questions were addressed.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m., and asked for proponents.

Brian Gruber, 7015 Lighthouse Way, Perrysburg, representing Otterbein Homes, said we agree with everything from workshop and are asking the Commission for approval of both applications.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none. Chair closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m.

A motion was made by Andrews, seconded by Rosan, to approve FDP-0003-2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[DR-0007-2013](#)

See discussion above.

A motion was made by Andrews, seconded by Thom, to approve

DR-0007-2013 with the condition that the Zoning Administrator have final approval of the landscape plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[Z-0001-2013](#)

To consider a Zoning application to zone 3.9 +/- acres located at 5593 Havens Corners Road; current zoning ROD/SF3 (Residential Overlay District/Single Family), requested zoning ROD/SF3; Brookewood Construction Company, Inc., Doug Maddy, applicant.

Gard said the application is as stated by the Chair; have an area map that shows what the original platting was for the property; was 9 lots; this is the new site plan; has a total of 15 lots; the original lot from the original zoning change request is not part of this application; so what we are looking at is the remainder of the lots; original platting was for 9 lots in total; the new site plan attached to zoning change is for 15 lots; the lot where the original house is on has been removed.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m., and asked for proponents.

David Hodge, Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad Street, said I am here on behalf of Brookewood; this property is currently zoned ROD SF-3; rezoning request is to the same zoning but to modify the existing development plan and plat in place on property; to reorient everyone, this property is on the south side of Havens Corners; the Farm Creek subdivision is to the east and the southeast; the Rathburn Woods subdivision is to the south and southwest; along the south of the site is the Souder Ealy Ditch; the ditch has been the subject of a lot of discussion concerning stormwater runoff; how it will affect the development and how will it be treated; last proposal we worked through this substantially; have developed some best management practices and green measures of stormwater treatment which would still be in place; this will include rain gardens, and because of the existing slope on the property that segues into the variance requests which are to only have sidewalks along the east side of the drive; also not have curb and gutters along Grand Ridge Ct.; that is to accommodate the stormwater; the flow across Grand Ridge Court into a ditch system will flow through different additional rain gardens and other treatment mechanisms to the south, outletting into the Souder Ealy Ditch; prior to our submitting this application our civil engineer met with Dave Ruder from Franklin Soil & Water Conservation; Ruder has encouraged this type of treatment for stormwater; if we go to workshop next week Ruder will be there to speak that he approves of this type of stormwater treatment; have some additional elevations; have first class renderings of the buildings to be constructed here; will use natural materials; first rate architecture; one of the lots, lot 12, has a barn on it and part of this proposal is to keep that barn in tact by sale of that property to someone else; that barn, upon the approval of this zoning, would become nonconforming and would be able to continue in its current state with improvements within its footprint; in the future when that barn comes down that lot could develop with a single family home; this plan is above and beyond what we did a few years ago; there is an environmental plan that was submitted; we submitted a traffic impact study and our traffic engineer is here if there are questions; conclusion of traffic study is that the impact on Havens Corners Road is nominal; no safety concerns to site, clear vision or access of safety vehicles or school buses; if you have any questions we have consultants here and request your positive recommendation to City Council; is consistent with Land Use plan and City vision and an appropriate addition to the City at this location.

Chair asked for opponents.

Rod Wilcox, 5582 Havens Corners Road, said I have spoken before when the application was defeated; I don't know what has changed; why are they including this

many lots; concerned about access to Havens Corners Road; traffic is terrible now; have to leave my house 5 to 10 minutes early to go anywhere; it would just be too much on Havens Corners; would be a disaster; not good for area; currently zoned for 8 lots which I could agree to, but 15 lots is ridiculous.

Pam Francis, 1050 Harvest Ridge Ct., said I do not see how they can put 15 homes on that lot; we are concerned about the water runoff and then no curbs or gutters leading to the street; is the water going to run to the back of the ditch; one of the newspapers spoke of a drainage system east of our subdivision; will there be a retention pond; one of our neighbors had foundation problems; don't know if anyone addressed that; there was talk about a 30' rear building set back zone; we have pine trees at the back of our lot; will they be preserved; tree fell down not sure if that was removed; who will maintain the ditch area, the neighbors or City; is there a preservation zone on the south side; will that remain; help alleviate the impervious areas.

Elsa Gurwin, 1165 Kames Way, said I also own the property at 5594 Havens Corners; they did not state the prices of the homes to go in; have been discussing the same thing for the last couple of years; looked at surrounding properties that have 60' lots; have those size lots in the subdivision that empties out at the YMCA, and a development on Morse Road that goes into green space and then larger lots; not very big lots; too small for this area; there is no green space; know this is zoned for 8 homes; he wants 14 houses; he is already building 5 houses on Clotts Road on the same amount of acreage in Jefferson Township; he is selling those at \$425,000 and \$399,000; but before he said he couldn't sell houses for that price so that was why he was going to have to build \$200,000 homes; you can do all the traffic studies you want but I have been on Havens Corners Road since I was born in 1964 and so has Mr. Wilcox; there are accidents going east when you are going to school because of the sun coming up all the time and going west you get them because I have had neighbors who ended up in my yard; this still doesn't solve the fact that this subdivision would be like an island; if there are children, there is no safe way for them to walk to school; there are no sidewalks to get them there; PD has already said they have had to pick up kids trying to walk to school on Havens Corners; 14 homes is ridiculous; he has made no concessions; what kind of people will we get in \$200,000 homes; look at the subdivision across from the YMCA and see what we would get; houses with 5' side yard; we don't want that.

Chair asked for rebuttal.

Hodge said I would like to address a few comments with accurate information; in reference to the Francis lot which is on the other side of lots 3 and 4; they have a swimming pool that was constructed nearly on the property line; we are committed to preserving the trees at that location and making the rear yard 30' instead of 25' as it is in the subdivision; concerning the sizes of lots the Francis lot to the east is 55' wide at the right of way; we have comparable lots; home values discussed considerably have not changed, in the \$300,000 to \$350,000 range which is consistent with the neighboring homes and aesthetically perfectly consistent; homes that surround are 3 1/2 units per acre; and recommended density is 3 to 5 houses per acre; consistent with Land Use Plan; with me is John Gallagher who submitted the traffic study to address some of the issues raised on impact on Havens Corners Road.

Chair said the rebuttal time is up; how much more time do you need. Hodge said two minutes; Planning Commission members agreed to extend the time.

John Gallagher, 7007 Discovery Blvd., traffic engineer, said the traffic impact study that was submitted to the City shows that the increase in the size of the neighborhood has a negligible effect on Havens Corners; the a.m. peak time would be 8 vehicles;

the majority of those turning left out; very minor; during the p.m. peak we expect 5 vehicles to make a left out; making a left in coming from out in the county during the a.m. peak we expect to be 2 vehicles; during the p.m. peak we expect 4 vehicles; this is using numbers and methods recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and what we use in Central Ohio on a regular basis to show impact of facilities; to address issues of the sun there is no doubt that certain times of the day the sun is in your eyes but to hang the impact on a developer would be unfair; no way he can mitigate the way the road was originally laid out.

Thom asked Wetherholt about the concerns on stormwater runoff; could you bring us up to date as far as the City goes. Wetherholt said since the last time we discussed this, the City has built the Gahanna Woods Detention Basin upstream which decreases the peak flows in the Souder Ditch an appreciable amount; we have also done a comprehensive study of the Souder Ditch; the bank needs to be stabilized; we have not gone forward with anything on that plan because of the way it impacts the residents there; so those are the two things that the City has done.

Keehner said I was hoping for something more innovative on that property; the notes that I have from the application supplement talks about environmental issues; it does address the water with the runoff; doesn't address topography in terms of the density; from what I see from the proposal that was withdrawn, if I understand, lot 12 is basically whoever buys and preserves the barn could later tear the barn down and put another house in there; so convince me that this is a substantially different proposal.

Andrews said I really don't get lot 8 with its little narrow drive access; I don't understand why that couldn't have been incorporated into one lot or space out a little more; I don't understand a little 18' strip of land going back to the back corner.

Wester said I have some questions; why no curb and gutters; how does that play into the environmental picture and stormwater drainage; would like more information on that; people with young families like subdivisions with sidewalks; is one of the things that makes a subdivision more of a neighborhood; what about a pathway; pathway in preservation zone; do not see any access; how will drainage get from the roadway to the creek; what efforts were made to put in something; a leftbound turn lane meets the warrant but you are not building one; MORPC came out with a Complete Streets plan; Complete Streets being able to address all sorts of traffic; be it bike lanes, pedestrian, or sidewalks, etc.; I don't know if the City has adopted that; Complete Streets may be a road map; like this to be given consideration also; definitely need to workshop this.

Rosan said I have a couple of requests to prepare for workshop; I would like to have the individual from Franklin Soil & Water bring more specifics about alternative water treatment measures; where you are envisioning those occurring throughout the development; maybe including those commitments in the overlay district description; in reviewing the residential overlay district document, your remarks concerning lots 3 and 4 and increased setback as well as the tree preservation are not in the language; the commitments concerning lot number 1 are there, but not lots 3 and 4; we received staff notes and there is a need for several fire hydrants; also remarks concerning possible right of way for trail development; I think that dovetails into a proposal for a trail through the preservation zone, lot 12 or 13, whether or not there is the possibility of any connectivity to the Rathburn Woods subdivision because I think that might address some concerns about kids walking to the middle school or friends or neighbors houses; because that is private property may not be possible but worth looking into; last if there are deed restrictions proposed for the development I would be interested in seeing them.

Price said I am not familiar with the treatment suggested with no curbs and gutters; would like to see photos of what that finish would look like; or ideas of neighborhoods that have used that recently; still have concerns with the safety issue and connectivity into sidewalks; like to know the possibilities; with schools making cuts in bussing and in other areas, trying to cut back I think this neighborhood could fall within the one mile radius of Lincoln Elementary or St. Matthews; I do think they mentioned the pedestrian path in the preservation zone was going to be mulch or wood chips; long term how is that going to be maintained.

Wester said I would also like to see how this dovetails with future plans for Havens Corners Road.

Thom said I would like to have discussion on reducing the lots to 12; like to see the density lowered, and how that would effect the entire site.

Price said there are a lot of people now who do not want large yards; Gahanna has a need for alternative neighborhoods; some people do not want a yard to keep up; also concerned about lot 8; could that become green space for parkland or space to tie into other neighborhoods.

Shepherd said I still have a concern about Fire Department comments; I know one time before when we had a cul de sac with an island in the center, they wanted to make sure they can drive over it; just some more details that it is okay with the Fire Department; is it going to be a flat design; the big trucks, especially the ladder trucks have trouble moving in a confined area. We would like to take this to workshop so questions can be answered; start at 6:30 p.m. next Wednesday the 20th. For the people who attended who are interested in the process you are welcome to come and listen; this time is more for Planning Commission members to get their questions answered.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

[V-0004-2013](#)

See discussion above.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

[S-0001-2013](#)

Questions or concerns are to be submitted to Sherwood, Gard and Evans from those who were not in attendance at the workshop, and also comments or concerns from everyone about pages 34 to the end.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

[DR-0009-2013](#)

Lew Griffin, 2737 Colts Neck, Blacklick, said thank you for the opportunity to be on the agenda tonight; the request is relatively the same; we have not changed the design of the building; we are taking some of our bump outs back in order to alleviate some of the controversy with the pilasters coming out into the right of way; what we decided to do was redesign the building and go with a flush front so we would not have to request a variance other than the portion of the building that was already in

the right of way; on Mill Street it is the vertical lines that define the buildings; asked Parker how far we really have to come out to get the look we have been after all along; we are coming out into the right of way now on the ground level 7 3/4". Griffin showed pictures and said we did a mock up of the sidewalk and one of the 4 pilasters; the tyvek wall is back behind the property line; black line is property line; the brick facing which you see is the existing brick that is on the building; what we are asking to do is have 2" cultured stone coming out on the tyvek wall; and then to make the pilasters look appropriate for the building and have a clean look we have to come out with 8" brick; so we are coming out from the tyvek area 10"; 2" for the cultured stone that is going on the building and 8" for the brick; so that is 7 3/4" from the property line; are going to have to come out 6" underneath in order to put in a foundation by code to put brick in; biggest problem is trying to make the building look good, having an investment in it and getting a reasonable return on the investment rather than putting a plain, non conforming front according to the vision of Creekside and putting it on that building. There was discussion about the application having to go to Council; Sherwood said, based on discussion with the City Attorney, no just the encroachment easement.

Keehner said this is a good compromise. Thom said the community should be ecstatic when they see this; think it will compliment Creekside and Olde Gahanna; small price to pay for the little bit of right of way we have to give up. Andrews said this is a great alternative and thank you for not going with just a straight flat front building.

Wester said I commend your efforts and perseverance; took the time to reach out to me yesterday and walk me through the changes to keep it within the property line; with regard to hardship, it certainly has been a financial hardship; the design as proposed would have very minimal impact on the right of way and property line; tremendous investment in building; fully support this; dramatic improvement and I will support.

Price said the building is very attractive; appreciate you addressing concerns even though it did pass; I know it has taken a toll on you financially and mentally; great addition; compromise minimizes the impact on the right of way and meets what you want on the building; compromise is appreciated.

Shepherd said this is a nice compromise; comply with the City; the way the building was built was part of the hardship. Thank you.

A motion was made by Rosan, seconded by Keehner, to approve DR-0009-2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Hamilton Road Corridor Committee -Andrews

Evans said we will continue to work on making the changes we discussed at Workshop.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney - None.

City Engineer - None.

Department of Development - None.

Chair - None.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - None.

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Rosan said I really enjoyed the PINK concert last Wednesday; know everyone worked hard in workshop and appreciate that, but had more fun!

L. ADJOURNMENT: 8:11 p.m.; Motion by Andrews.