

# **City of Gahanna**

*200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, August 23, 2000**

**Commission Members meet in Committee of the Whole**

**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*

**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, August 23, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on August 18, 2000. Chair David B. Thom called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission Member Greenblott.

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

**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-0011-2000**

To consider a zoning change application to rezone 2.5 acres currently zoned L-AR as CC-2; to rezone 1.8 acres currently zoned ER-2 as CC-2; for property located at 4598 Hamilton Road and extending to the east; to allow a retail/grocery use; Continental Real Estate by Sean Cullen, applicant.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Sean Cullen, Continental Real Estate, stated he was present representing Giant Eagle; a few issues came up at workshop; will address those when we get to preliminary and final development plan stage; this is just the zoning change at this point on the 2 parcels; glad to answer any questions.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Canter questioned the timetable on the annexed property. Cullen stated that the zoning change application was submitted July 5; when 60 day hold is up for acceptance of the annexation in late September, the zoning on that will be heard.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Thom stated we would send this back to workshop on September 6; primarily to discuss some legal opinions with our City Attorney regarding limited overlay and this rezoning text; mostly for our clarification on how we are to handle this rezoning application; workshop on September 6 at 6:15 p.m. and then public hearing will be reopened on September 13; need to get things ironed out on our legal questions; should be ready to go on the 13th.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**FDP-0014-2000**

To consider a final development plan application to allow the construction of a condominium and apartment community; pending zoning of L-AR, Limited Overlay Apartment Residential; for 32.95 acres located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services by Glen Dugger, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/3/00).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:11 p.m.

Chair asked for proponents. D'Ambrosio requested this go to workshop on September 6.  
 Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

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

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**V-0022-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1163.02(a), Number of parking spaces; to reduce to the number of parking spaces per dwelling unit from 2 to 1.5 to maximize open space; for property located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services by Glen Dugger, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/17/00)

See discussion on previous application.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**DR-0053-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a condominium and apartment community; for property located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services by Glen Dugger, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**CU-0012-2000**

To consider a conditional use application to allow a rental car office; for property located at 1346 Cherrybottom Road; Village Square at Cherrybottom; current zoning PCC; Enterprise Rent A Car by Bill Salyer, applicant. (Public Hearing requested to be postponed until 8/23/00 by applicant)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Kevin Iskovits; 4701 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio, stated he was present for Enterprise Rent-A-Car for location at 1346 Cherrybottom Road; am in charge of 27 locations locally; this is a local neighborhood company; primary business is replacing vehicles while owners are in shop; have contract with A-1 Collision; most transactions are on their property; also have contracts with Toyota North and Nissan on Morse Road; this is a conditional use application; appreciate your consideration.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Peck asked how many cars they reasonably can expect on the lot at one time; are taking 20 parking spaces; is 20 the inventory and expect 10 or 15 out and providing enough parking in case they are all back. Iskovits stated he would hope inventory would be larger; is a business of utilization; run 90% utilized at any given time; plan for the worst; and feel the worst case is 20; believe that 60 to 80 cars would be fleet; 20 cars could be sitting at any given time. In response to question from Greenblott, Iskovits stated that their cars have no writing on them; do have an "E" sticker on the bumper.

Turley asked the dimensions in the rear; concerned about Buddy's Carpet being able to get to the loading dock. Jeff Block stated he was the property owner; currently behind the center where we drew the spaces is 60 feet' felt there would still be room to get delivery trucks and trash in and out at that point; down further to north the roadway drops down to 40'; only needed additional parking for 3 more spaces; would actually be 40' between back of building and trucks; that is what exists now for 2/3 of center; think we will be fine with that.

Canter asked if it was owner's preference to park behind. Block stated that because we had the space back there felt it was appropriate; could comfortably put out front; since business was not such that customers would be coming in and out felt this was better utilization of space. Canter stated she had driven back there and did not feel it was easily navigable; concerned if they are parking back there; doesn't matter to me personally. Block stated that down by BW3 it is the narrowest it can be; if a truck stops there for delivery it will slow things down; as long as we stayed in width felt we are OK. Canter stated it would not make her unhappy if the cars sat in the lot during the day; want to keep ability for high volume of customers if they didn't want to take front parking spaces; if Enterprise isn't concerned that's fine. In response to question, Enterprise stated most of their business is Monday through Friday; on weekends they are not usually serviced.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

MOTION was made at this point in the meeting.

Peck stated there was a similar application a couple of weeks ago for a similar use; feel this is a professional use of automotive service as opposed to repair; draw the distinction with regard to this application; feel this is in an appropriate area of commercial; automotive is a conditional use and feel it is more in character with PCC like this location; will support.

Canter stated she will support because it meets Section 1169.03(a) 1 thru 4, as approval requirements for conditional use.

**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-0013-2000**

To consider a final development plan to allow construction of a medical office building for property located at 219 North Hamilton Road; current zoning CC, Community Commercial; Sussex Land Company by George Parker, applicant. (Public Hearing. 08/09/00, 08/23/00, 09/13/00, 10/11/00, 10/25/00).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Chair asked for proponents. Chair stated applicant had asked for a postponement; assign this item to workshop on September 6 at 7:05 p.m. with public hearing to be reopened on September 13; could be postponed further if plans are not complete.

Chair asked for opponents. Tom Liszkay, 457 Tresham apologized for not being here two weeks ago; have spoken before you many times on zoning and land use on Hamilton Road corridor; have real concerns with the proposed development saw last week; realize this is commercial type zoning within a neighborhood; makes it more difficult as a citizen to address; not trying to change the zoning but allow something that is allowed in that zoning district; looking around the neighborhood the creek is the boundary for our commercial district; all kinds of commercial is south of there; Gatsby's, Kroger's, etc; nothing north of the creek except for small medical office; discussion many times years ago that the creek was the final step for our commercial development; also looking at height of buildings; not many 2 story buildings in the area; City Hall is 2 story, High School is 3 story; are some atriums of buildings and church steeples but nothing else tall; recommend that you give consideration to a 1 story building; don't need big box architecture we see in many parts of Columbus; am concerned about lighting; went there at night and it is pitch black right now; even Lutheran Church turns off its lighted sign; is a nice dark neighborhood; feel that a 24 hour operation would be detrimental to

residents of the area; would not like to see that medical building at Johnstown and Hamilton duplicated on this site; lighting bleeds out of parking lot and lights are on all night; is huge; have talked about the Heartland Plan; Hamilton Road corridor and Carpenter Road are part of the plan; they are to remain residential; it is coming in to place; Parker is a good architect; hope we can get this reduced to something acceptable to a residential area.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:26 p.m.

Canter stated she didn't want to blind side applicant; would like for Engineering and Development request the applicant prepare a traffic impact study on the site due to size they are proposing; is difficult to navigate the intersection without an estimated 18,000 ADT they are stating would be generated; will have a significant impact on that intersection; ask applicant to submit.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**V-0019-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1163.02(a), Number of Parking Spaces; for property located at 219 N. Hamilton Road; for construction of a medical office building; Sussex Land Company by George Parker, applicant. (Public Hearing. 08/09/00, 08/23/00, 09/13/00, 10/11/00, 10/25/00).

See discussion on previous application.

**Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing**

**HOP-0004-2000**

To consider a Home Occupation Permit to allow babysitting; for property located at 5625 Havens Corners Road; Marica M. Parks, applicant. (Public Hearing).

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

Marica Parks, 5625 Havens Corners Road, stated she was applying for a home occupation for after school care.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Turley asked if this would be after school care exclusively. Parks stated she would have one preschooler who will remain with me but aiming for after school care. In response to questions, Parks stated she had a long driveway that has a turnaround; is on a 1 acre lot; don't believe will have 12 right away; believe it will be 6 or less; will be utilizing the lower level only; not sure of square footage; am renting this home; believe it might be about 600 s.f. out of a total of a 1,200 s.f. house; state law permits up to 12 as long as they are elementary school age children. Peck stated there is one preschooler right now; proposed hours of operation are listed for after school from 2:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Parks stated the preschooler comes at 8:30; main group of children will be afternoon only; will be no weekends or nights; occasionally some parents work later but normally all be gone by 6:00; will be available for extra hours but not on a routine basis. In response to question from Smith, Parks stated she would need to wait a week to definitely answer a transportation question; still working on bus schedules to see if the children will be allowed to be dropped off at my home; not like we are adding 12 trips as the busses will be dropping them off; don't see adding traffic; most people will drive right by; not adding traffic to the neighborhood; difference from earlier application is that we will not be using even half of the home; this is definitely a babysitting service not a business.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Mullin asked if applicant was aware that no employees are allowed; other concern falls under Section 1177.03(b) of the code; item 6 states that the area used shall not exceed 25% of gross floor area or 500 s.f. and discussion so far doesn't meet requirement. White stated that section is usually interpreted to mean square footage dedicated to the business and converted so it is not generally residential; facility when you go in would appear to have a school atmosphere; with this application she is not converting anything; will just come in to sit on a couch; there is no conversion of any part of the house dedicated to the business so that it can't be used for a residential purpose.

Canter stated this application is different than what was proposed before; actually spoke of a business of the enrichment center; what's discussed tonight is strictly babysitting; agree with Mullin on concern of square footage but this is not dedicated space; won't appear like an office; splitting hairs a little bit; traffic issue has been dealt with; can support.

Turley stated she will support; understand the 500 s.f. limitation but any home day care involves most of the house; a residential neighborhood is appropriate location for child care; do have concerns on numbers but after school helps; won't have too great impact on the neighborhood.

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

- Yes**      **3**      Smith, Canter and Chairman Thom
- No**        **2**      Mullin and Peck

**V-0020-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1171.04(a)(12), Fence Standards, to allow a fence to be installed backwards; for property located at 676 Juniper Lane; Phyllis S. Cales, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/17/00)

White noted that a letter had been received withdrawing this request and asking for a refund; feel applicant did not get best advice from this department on ways to proceed; ask you approve this request for refund.

**A motion was made to recommend to Council the refund of the \$75 fee by Phyllis S. Cales for V-0020-2000.. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**V-0021-2000**

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1150.03(f)(1), Front Yard Depth Requirements; for property located at 175 Carpenter Road; Robert J. Hosfeld, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/17/00).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Chair asked for proponents. There were none. Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Smith stated he did not feel applicant's presence would enhance or detract from discussion. Greenblott stated she would like to vote this evening.

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

Motion was made by Mullin to approve V-0021-2000, seconded by Greenblott.

Discussion: Mullin stated that initial inclination was somewhat negative in review of the

application; but upon giving the matter some thought and reflecting on information presented, the section of the code that is requested to be varied reads that the depth of front yards shall be not less than twenty five feet measured from the right of way line of the street or streets upon which it fronts; survey attached to the application; presume heavy lines are the property line and would also be the right of way line for Carpenter and Shull; building as it exists today would be 12-1/2 feet behind the right of way for Carpenter Road; the 25' dimension shown is from the edge of pavement; is not necessarily the right of way line; given that information and viewing the proposed improvements and knowing that by all appearances the building setback front or side is really 12-1/2 feet, am not so sure granting of the variance would have detrimental effect on the neighborhood or character of the surrounding properties; if carried out in the manner proposed in the application the addition would enhance the property and therefore the adjacent properties as well.

Canter stated she felt Mullin has excellent points; if applicant was here could discuss the size of porch; possibly reduce it somehow to be less intrusive into front yard; also have always given an applicant a second chance to be present; would like applicant here; something could have come up we are not aware of; applicant has right to be heard.

Peck stated that not having considered issues raised by Mullin, feel it has some merit; was prepared to vote; in reading Section 1150.03(f)(1) it does state from right of way line; not sure we know where right of way line is; shows edge of pavement; but edge of pavement has nothing to do with right of way line; until clarified don't know that we have enough information to vote at this time.

Smith stated he would go along with postponement; already doesn't meet 25' setback; asking us to add an additional 42" into setback; already is in a varied state whether we recognize it or not; do think it is an improvement; wait for applicant; don't know what he will add in terms of discussion on 42"; have given others front porch extensions; would be an enhancement to that part of Olde Gahanna.

Motion to postpone was made at this point in the meeting.

Canter requested we get an actual right of way marking on the site plan. Komlanc stated that property line is existing; with regard to addition of porch, will also be adding stairs going into it; stairs that would encroach further; how far would it extend out.

**A motion was made by Mullin that this matter be Postponed to Date Certain. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**S-0002-2000**

To consider the Creekside Development Conceptual Plan recommended for approval by Planning Commission on August 23, 2000; originally referred by City Council to Planning Commission on July 5, 2000 to obtain public input for recommendation on adoption of said plan.

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Chair asked for proponents. Marjorie Figley, 401 Vista Drive, stated she had a business at 83 Granville Street; came here tonight in support of Creekside; one of the reasons I located here was because of the growth and prospective growth I saw; wanted to voice my belief in what is going on; from a business standpoint as well; with regard to growth it has been wonderful; feel this is a positive move; thank you.

Randy Sisler, C&N Leasing; 171 North High Street, stated they had 2 parcels at High and Carpenter; also operate Gahanna Auto & Truck Service; speaking as a proponent; in

business career have found that nothing stays the same; need to add back to the community; feel this is a positive step; as Gahanna business grows volume and profitability will grow; will increase property values; there may be some uprooted businesses; existing Gahanna businesses deserve the same respect as when we court new businesses; some have been virtually unmarketable; taken a wait and see attitude with property and wonder if it exists; a private sector codeveloper using our property to complement the development would be wonderful; welcome the opportunity to be part of this.

Chair asked for opponents.

Tom Liszkay, 457 Tresham Road, stated he spoke against the canal systems about 3 years ago in front of this body; thought we wouldn't see it come back; is starting to creep east of Mill St. again; have done nice things along the creek with walkways and fountains; against developing what I consider a theme park; don't want to see noise, light, traffic; not complaining, but if this goes to the original plan could have entertainment every single night; ask that you take a good look at this; limit the canals to the west side of Mill Street; please don't bring into the heart of Olde Gahanna; assume City is pretty sure that this will economically go; was up at Rt. 161 and Schrock this afternoon; there sits a huge empty plaza called French Market; many of you remember when that was booming and it is now shuttered; even though residential European style is built all around; even though people can walk to it, for some reason it died; this could fail also; thank you.

John Stewart, 153 N. High Street, stated he lived in the center of the area where the canal is to go; missed the public hearing last time as we were on vacation; read the newspaper and just found out our property would be taken for parking lot and canal; were upset by that; been here 15 years; will be out in cold; lot of propaganda about what was happening; wanted to hear what was being said; objecting to our house being taken; hope somebody can comment.

Clyde Paxton, stated he was Pastor of the Outreach Community Church, 147 N. High; understand we are in the plans but not sure where we are at; just wondering and trying to gather information; haven't received any information from the Planning Commission about where our church is involved; only know what I read in the paper; been doing a lot of renovations but if Church will be a parking lot, wouldn't like to have invested our money in upkeep at this point; Church was here long before any of us were here; has served the community for over 100 years; God has placed us there to serve also; hadn't made plans to move; do we have any options; does the Planning Commission have final say; is it etched in stone.

Thom stated this was a concept plan which is a recommendation to City Council; they have final determination on what the plan will look like; this is just a concept plan; believe you are talking about the old Community Church where I attended when I was a kid; will let Development Director respond shortly; input you are having this evening will help determine our recommendation. Canter stated this would not be the last opportunity to speak; if it develops that we are recommending, will be no immediate building going on those parcels; this is if it develops; this plan goes to Council next; once approved if there are no applications there would be no buildings; Development Department can go to citizens and businesses and say this is what we envision; they will be in touch with us personally.

Chair asked for rebuttal. White stated for Pastor Paxton, the revised plan is conceptual; may not come to fruition; is a guide or principle; this is one of the things we looked at



with consultant; discussed possibility of a Historical Board for downtown development; believe this building is not on register but does have historical and architectural significance; have looked at using a parking consultant on how to perfect our parking structure; configuration they suggested is more of a rectangle; moved parking structure north which means it would not take away the main body of the original Church structure; working on the other part; in the event that would occur then City and or developers would ensure that Church would be compensated for that; could be dollars or new space; that would occur; have not approached any of the particular property owners yet; can't say right now what we can do because we don't have a principal plan; for Stewart on High Street, if it moved north could miss that property; only houses we have looked at are directly behind the car wash; again haven't gotten to that point; property owner always has the right not to sell; would have to look at what we are proposing; would negotiate with each property owner; everyone we have bought from so far has been satisfied; with regard to the canal system the initial plan didn't get shown to anyone because canal went across Mill Street; majority of people that saw it have not objected to the canal; know we can take it across by authority and jurisdiction; whether we should remains to be determined; cost will be a factor; concept shows the extension of the canal; whether that occurs haven't gotten to that; French Market was totally a privately driven development and developers took all the money out of that project and did not reinvest; one of the reasons we make investments is so there are public controls to assist in those areas; can't just develop and then leave it sitting; not our concept to leave any kind of tourist water park type project; this is an urban village type development; has a certain balance and density; is a niche kind of market; we are working towards a plan that will guide us in the revitalization and redevelopment of downtown; if we work through this and it is adopted by Council will be our guiding principles as we deal with the very concrete elements that will have to come back to Planning Commission; have some time to continue to have input; that's what's nice about this kind of project; maybe you will want to be part of this exciting area and stay where you are so you can be a part of it; this is a public private partnership.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:08 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Canter stated discussion at last workshop indicated a two story height along Mill Street for purpose of village scale with the understanding that the canal level is lower than Mill Street and some of those structures might have an additional story; no specification as to structure use or parking garages; Mullin questioned the parking structure; Peck was concerned with writing exception for 2 buildings; decided to set a development standard at two stories knowing there would be variances all the way along; Mullin felt strongly about 2 stories above Mill Street level; some members felt there need to be some availability to have some three story; some structures could be 3 story, some could be 4 and still not be 2 stories above Mill Street; Mullin felt introduction of exception for use as a hotel and parking structure was unfortunate at best; struck comment about hotel and parking garage.

Peck stated he wanted to take a minute before vote to explain what vote means and why voting the way I am; fully support the recommendations out of our workshop last Thursday; at the same time, am struggling with the concept plan as presented for a couple of reasons; first the issue over the past month or so is the number of jobs generated; that is under the purview of Council; they decide how public funds are spent, we don't; our purview is quality of life issues; being asked to make a recommendation where we should; note a dramatic shift for development; for 30 years all density has been put to virtually edges of city limits; nothing of this scale has been tried in the core

city that I can remember; all dense development has been to Morse Road or Hamilton corridor or in the industrial zone; recognize that this is dramatic shift in development strategy; not each piece should be developed to its highest and best use or maximum use; arguably a person could justify a 7-11 in a residential neighborhood; just because you can make a buck doesn't mean you can or should; with that in mind as to market driven we only answer the question if we can; it doesn't answer question if we should; understand this is a concept plan and is subject to modification; but we are talking about 300,000 s.f. of new commercial space; 250,000 s.f. of new office space; that is twice what we just approved for Daimler buildings; it is 4 times the size of building George Parker is proposing; even as a concept we are proposing to shove all this into 2 blocks of land; do support revitalizing Olde Gahanna; support extending the waterway and ways for people to use the area; support the festival type atmosphere that has been brought back to this community; support mixed use development but do not support it at anywhere near the scale talked about; because I am concerned about the scale can't support the concept plan before us; does not mean I will never support; can't in good conscience support something I consider too far out of scale; the scale with where we are putting it; can't handle infrastructure; talked about curb cuts and adding lanes; Mill Street is as wide as its going to get; Granville Street can handle because it's 5 lanes but traffic has to turn somewhere; that will be High Street unless you run down Shull or Hamilton; traffic will find a way; give them the parameters and they will find; with this kind of density and the way it and infrastructure are that cannot and should not be expanded can't support; and at expense of village feel; for those reasons while heartily support work of this Commission and public input, can't support the concept plan as it is before us.

Canter stated that the original proposal as its written is too dense; our statement was a minimization of the density of the project; first thing and strongest issue we felt we needed to deal with; have to start somewhere; can't begin to revitalize; feel this will be changed many times; canal will change to something City will agree on; many plans are before us and public is welcome at any time; will support; have to get off square one; has to be something that is concrete and tangible; will support the plan.

Smith stated that in the 6 years he has been doing this he doesn't take studies lightly; concept plans tend to become reality; in terms of West Side Redevelopment, Olde Gahanna, North Triangle and can go on; it is the pictures; the pictures present to people a reality; the focus tends to come true; believe we have had some red herrings thrown before us that should be thrown back into the creek; believe in the TIF; what isn't answered is the private dollars; they tend to go where people are; you can drive by any night and people are there; haven't been times we couldn't get down there; that goes to the traffic question; with regard to the French Market which is a vast place and was popular at one time, believe in my heart of hearts that it is a case where someone let a development deteriorate; with community we have here our citizens wouldn't let that happen; one is a concept and second is that we like and enjoy and appreciate what we have done so far; the concept plan makes a leap of faith and will support; appreciate what we have been able to create to this extent; believe it will just keep getting better.

Mullin stated the Commission has been involved in reviewing the concept; has been evolving from what you see on easel to what is on screen as part of the discussions the Planning Commission has had; information that Development Department has gained along the way; what the actual scope of the development may or may not be is still up in the air; not sure we can quantify that even though there are numbers in the study; don't know how many square feet will be in the development at this time; will be an ongoing refinement of the concept; don't know total construction costs; somebody has thrown some numbers at it but what the basis is, is hard to tell; most significant thing about

numbers is that if you build "X" number of square feet you can reasonably assume you will spend "X" number of dollars; some dollar figures address strictly the initial development and not the building construction that would follow; question before us this evening is not so much one of this is the plan we want to recommend to be followed but does this plan have sufficient merit to warrant further study and investigation prior to making final recommendation on implementation; feel the merit is present; we've all seen what is put forth as a concept plan when reality sets in and construction begins; may or may not be a whole lot of resemblance to what we are talking about tonight or see in 5 to 10 years down the road; that's the reason for further study and analysis on how concept can be turned into a viable space for the City.

Turley stated she could support on a conceptual level with the addition of the comments outlined that placed limits; is time to move forward and continue with momentum; lot of people are pleased with the development; area needs revitalized; can't be too timid; is a lot of competition with Easton and other new developments; need to make a strong statement; canal gives it a uniqueness; makes sense for the heart of the City to be more dense; most of us are talking about numbers; it is more dense than it is now; issues such as traffic will be issues down the road; project won't happen if traffic can't be accommodated; feel we are ready to move forward.

Greenblott stated that when we concentrate densest development on perimeter we deplete many existing retail centers; is called sprawl; strongly support the vision of our City administration in revitalizing Olde Gahanna; is recycling and am proud of the vision of our City and rejuvenation; will be a tough job as we look at each individual piece; with recommendation believe we can build something we can be proud of; will support.

Thom stated that having grown up in Olde Gahanna recall 500 people in the community; with present population at 35,000 have seen a lot of good growth; have done good things over the years; wouldn't have gotten to where we are; is a great community and am proud of it; conceptual plan is a good plan; is a start; there will be some changes; comment was made that if we don't continue to move forward we'll fall backwards; when we fall back, we will die.

#### **Discussed**

**A motion was made by Canter, seconded by Mullin, to approve the Creekside Development Conceptual Plan subject to the following recommendations established on August 17, 2000:**

- 1. The first recommendation is a minimization of the density of the project. Most buildings along Mill Street should not exceed two stories above Mill Street level.**
- 2. Setbacks and open space requirement for the canal should be maximized.**
- 3. Parking structures should be smaller as reflected in concept schematic dated August 17, 2000.**
- 4. A definite theme is recommended as well. A mixed use/residential development is essential. Planning Commission would like to see that the plan maintain a "village" atmosphere with more of a market type feeling. "Mom and Pop" businesses should be stressed with art festival vendors in mind. Planning Commission would like to see subsidized leases similar to Pikes Market in Seattle, WA. Maintaining existing business should also be a key to the concept plan. Finally, an anchor must be established.**
- 5. Other recommendations include creating a Creekside Authority to oversee the maintenance and enforcement of the development standards.**
- 6. There should be an investigation into rerouting Route 62 out of the Creekside area.**

7. Planning Commission recommends that an independent marketing study be prepared after the concept plan has been adopted. A traffic study should accompany this report. . The motion carried by the following vote:

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

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DR-0051-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage; for property located at 294 South Hamilton Road; Taco Bell by DaNite Sign Co., applicant.

Clerk stated a fax had been received from sign company requesting this item be withdrawn.

Withdrawn

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0054-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage for property located at 1075 E. Johnstown Road; The Goddard School, by Sign Vision Co., applicant.

Ron Monroe, 947 E. Johnstown Road, stated he was present representing Sign Vision Corporation; asking for your approval of signage for The Goddard School.

Greenblott asked about the carousel horse; is it three dimensional. Monroe stated it will have a dimension to it; will be against the wall; couple of inches thick probably or just a sign width; will be next to the doorway behind the post; is the logo that they use and was placed next to entrance; is for eye attraction. Greenblott stated the building sign colors will be different than the freestanding sign. Monroe stated he was not sure why; didn't design this sign; the ground sign is green background with gold letters; carousel has three colors; shutters are green. Turley stated she did not have a problem with the lettering for The Goddard School but it should match shutters and signage.

Smith asked the intent of the changeable copy. Monroe stated the company didn't say. Smith stated his preference is to take off the changeable copy. Monroe stated he did not have authority to agree to that. Smith stated if it was part of the motion they agreed to it or they resubmitted; we won't support changeable copy. Canter asked if we wanted the building sign to match the shutters; some coordination of free standing to building sign. Thom asked if there were enough questions to send this to workshop. Greenblott asked for specifics on landscape material. Turley agreed there should be a third; three is more attractive than 2; throw in a third complementary landscape feature.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Turley stated that since no color name or PMS color was submitted, is the color shown pretty accurate. Monroe stated it was; is set to match the shutters.

Canter asked if the sign was to be externally illuminated. Monroe said it was not his understanding that it would be lit. Canter stated it does not show on submittal so there can be no lighting of the sign.

Discussed

A motion was made by Canter to approve subject to the following:

- 1) That the 4" changeable copy be removed from the ground sign.

2) That the color of the building sign that reads "The Goddard School" be changed to match the green of the ground sign; and

3) That the landscape plan reflect a third plant material to complement the two as proposed.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

**DR-0055-2000**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 207 West Johnstown Road; City Barbeque by SIncom Inc., applicant.

Bruce Somerfelt, SignCom, stated they were applying for a free standing sign in front of 207 West Johnstown Road; banner was more black than green. In response to question on whether this does set back 15' from right of way, Somerfelt replied that it will; understand the need for three different deciduous plants; is not illuminated.

Komlanc stated that on the plan submitted with regard to the location of sign we don't have a platted subdivision; rely on county records; right of way is 30' from center line; 15' from that would be 30'; do have plans to reconstruct West Johnstown Road; need to make sure it stays within that 15' setback for temporary construction easements.

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

**H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**Committee of the Whole: No Report.**

**C.I.C: No Report.**

**Creekside Development Team**

Greenblott stated the last meeting was cancelled; did attend a MORPC meeting; let Planning Commission know that it is possible to put canal under Mill Street.

**Olde Gahanna Design Review Committee: No report.**

**Sign Code Committee: No report.**

**I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

**City Attorney: No report.**

**Zoning Administrator: No report.**

**City Engineer.**

Komlanc stated that for the North Hamilton Road widening project discussed in the joint meeting on July 31, we need final comments by next Friday, September 1. Thom placed this item on the workshop agenda.

**Director of Development.**

White thanked Planning Commission for energy, time, and diligence they put in to the conceptual plan; struggling with urban versus village and is one of the things we will

look at; have to be taken and felt in terms of this whole concept; these are recommendations we can use; also needs to be coupled with other facets of the development; rest assured of that; am the new person but do live and work the community; participate and buy here; we don't want something that will be hustle and bustle; our task will be to look at it and balance it; to know that's what we are trying to accomplish; all the opportunity for participation and input;; will make for better overall plan; am concerned about the canal; am not married to every detail of the plan; here to make the plan work.

**Chair.**

Thom welcomed Word to her new position as Deputy Clerk of Council.

**J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None.**

**K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

Peck echoed that he does support doing something at Creekside; one of things striving for is to be as open and clear as we can be; there is a price to pay for everything we do; some things will go by the wayside; that's part of change; owe it to the community to be as direct as we can; is very easy to get caught up in the festivals we have; think as we position before the community need to be up front on how it impacts not just the center of the city but does it affect how White goes to work and how Rose Run people get downtown; what will it do to Carpenter Road; once it is approved certain things are natural consequences; if this is what you want to do this is what will happen; continue that process as we go.

Greenblott stated she saw this as a guide for the future of Gahanna.

**L. ADJOURNMENT: 8:55 p.m.**

.

---

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC/AAE  
Clerk of Council

---

**Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC**  
**Clerk of Council**

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

---

**Chair Signature**