

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 11, 2002

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

Richard A. Peck, Chair

Jane Turley, Vice Chair

Cynthia G. Canter

Candace Greenblott

P. Frank O'Hare

Donald R. Shepherd

Othelda A. Spencer

Tanya M. Word, Deputy Clerk of Council

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, September 11, 2002. The agenda for this meeting was published on September 5, 2002. Chair Richard A. Peck called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. with a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the 9-11-01 tragedy followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission member, Richard Peck.

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

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA

Chair stated that DR-0067-2002 will be moved to Unfinished Business.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 28, 2002

A motion was made by Greenblott, seconded by Vice Chairman Turley, to approve the minutes of August 28, 2002. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

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

E. APPLICATIONS:

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

FDP-0012-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Gahanna Properties, L.L.C. to be located at 1360 N. Hamilton Road; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/15/02). (Public Hearing held on 08/28/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:07 P.M.

Glen A. Dugger, 37 W. Broad Street, stated this is a necessary revision that was required when we revised the site plan to move Walgreens from the location immediately south of Monro Muffler to the location immediately north of the Giant Eagle entrance drive; as a part of that Final Development Plan, we moved Bob Evans and Tumbleweed to the north; Tumbleweed found that location unacceptable; we have requested this application FDP-0012-2002, final development plan for lot B, which was the former Tumbleweed parcel, it be used for retail development consistent with the balance of the project we have submitted; we have submitted architecture elevations; landscaping plans, etc.; regarding V-0027-2002, is for the same property; this is for lot B; we are short by two-tenths's of one percent on the original application; think it went to five percent on the revised application; the lot coverage was calculated after the dedication to the City was taken out of the stream relocation area; as well as the 12 ft. additional right-of-way that was also requested to the City; DR-0056-2002, as with the above mentioned applications, this application is for lot B; building architecture has been submitted which is consistent with the Walgreens, the Bob Evans, and the other prior approved retail; has entrances on both the east and west face; very consistent and very well done; DR-0055-2002 is the overall sign package for all the signs contained within the Walgreens development; we have monument signs in front of Walgreens, Bob Evans, the lot B retail; the final component of the package is SWP-0012-2002; this had been approved in August; there was a line that when we had to reallocate parking and

accommodate the retail development on lot B as opposed to Tumbleweed being slightly about 5 ft.; therefore we are resubmitting an SWP for the approved Subdivision without Plat; it changes one lot line; that lot line is the north line of lot B; there has been some significant discussion between the residents of Polo Club Villas, the applicant, and myself; there were a number of what we thought were resolved issues, that turned out to be unresolved; we have met and talked with all interested parties; prior to the Public Hearing meeting this evening, the Planning Commission was provided with 1 1/2 pages of commitments that we are willing to make for the residents at Polo Club; it is important to the residents of Polo Club Villas that they become a part of tonight's record; one of the reasons the residents are supportive of going forward is because we have agreed to these additional commitments; they do however, require that we revise some components of our prior approved Final Development plan and landscape package; we will have to bring those items back to the Commission; we will do as soon as the drawings become available; want to note that the 6th issue in our list of commitments was originally stricken by my client; I have talked them back into this commitment, for the record we have agreed to that provision as well; again this is not concerning any of the formal components of lot B, but they are important to the residents of Polo Club Villas.

O'Hare asked regarding the monument sign that is on the monitor, will it have the typical flower bed area like the other two signs. Dugger replied yes it will; that was commitment that we made last week in workshop; the only difference is that this sign in order to be consistent with the others is not on the down grade, it is on a flat level surface. Turley asked does that mean that the sign will be a lot taller than the other signs. Dugger stated that the signs will be the same height as measured from Hamilton & Morse regardless of where they are on the down slope of the grade.

Corrine Wagner, 482 Canterring Place W., stated that she is here as a representative of the Polo Club Villas; we have indeed come to an agreement of the following commitments:

1. Eighteen (18) trees to be planted by Developer on Polo Club side of fence: 5 Red Maples, 9 White Pine, 4 Black Hill Spruce. Location of trees will be approved in the field by Polo Club Board of Trustees or their representatives. White Pines will be 7 ft. tall; the Red Maples will the same height as west side of fence; the Black Hill Spruces will be the same height side of fence. (All of this is subject to the Planning Commission review).
2. Developer will maintain each tree for a period of one year after it is planted. At the end of one year after a tree is planted, if that tree is healthy, the Polo Club will become responsible for maintaining that tree; if any tree is not healthy one year after it is planted, the Developer will replace that tree and then will maintain the replacement tree for an additional period of one year after it is planted; it is the intent of the Developer and Polo Club that this maintenance and replacement cycle will continue on a tree-by-tree basis until such time as Polo Club has assumed responsibility for eighteen (18) trees, each of which first was maintained by Developer in a healthy condition for one year.
3. Color of fence will be tan, 6 ft. in height, running completely on the property line from Morse Road to the south termination point as shown on the landscape plan approved by the Gahanna Planning Commission in August; the fence color is acceptable only if there is not a cost difference with white fence; otherwise the fence color is to be white.
4. Two gates in fence are to be locking type; keys for these locks are to be retained by

the City of Gahanna,

- 5. Signs for egress to Morse Road stating "Access to Morse Road Westbound from Hamilton Road exit only."; sign to be no larger than a typical stop sign.
- 6. Developer agrees to close gap between Giant Eagle fence and Walgreens fence if legally permitted to do so, and Developer agrees to make reasonable good faith efforts to obtain such permission.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Canter stated that resident associations come and go; asked who is the Polo Club. Dugger stated that it is my understanding that our agreement lies with the Polo Club Villas Association Board; the Board is a legal entity which controls the ownership and maintenance of common open space areas. Canter stated there are a number of sub-divisions that have resident associations that are now defunct and these plantings that were done at the inception of the sub-division was beautiful and have now just gone bad and rotten; if they (the residents of Polo Club Villas) are going to accept the responsibility in the beginning, someone needs to accept the responsibility coming out. Dugger commented that he agreed with Canter; thinks that the distinction here is that the condo is a viable functioning condo association; believe there is a high degree of interest in this issue. Canter advised that she just wants to protect the City. Dugger commented that the other important factor here is that the association wanted to make sure they didn't get just a bunch of trees that died in a year; what we are essentially doing is at the end of that one year, that we are the one that enforces the one year warranty; the intent is that we are to get them through the one year maintenance period; that is why paragraph 2 is as complicated as it is. Wagner stated that the Polo Club Villa Association is a viable functioning association with 132 members.

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

Regarding DR-0056-2002, Turley stated that although she has some concerns regarding the size of the tenant panel sign proposed for this site; will be supporting the application in this context only in that this is a very intensely developed commercial corner and the proposed tenant panel harmonizes and ties in with the other signs around it.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	4	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott
------------	----------	--

V-0027-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1153.03(c)(7); for property located at 1360 N. Hamilton Road; to exceed the lot coverage ratio by 0.2%; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C. by Kathy Rojina, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 8/15/02). (Public Hearing held on 8/28/02).

See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes	4	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott
------------	----------	--

DR-0056-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 1360 N. Hamilton Road; by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0055-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 4919 Morse Road; by Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

SWP-0012-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to amend the previously approved SWP-0002-2002; total acreage of proposed parcel 8.963; current zoning CC-2; for property located on Morse & Hamilton Roads; Gahanna Properties, L.L.C., Kathy Rojina, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

Z-0013-2002

To consider a zoning application on 3.9 acres of newly annexed property located at 600 Cross Pointe Road; requested zoning of M-1 Manufacturing District; Current Zoning is Township; Donald R. Kenney and Company, by Robert E. Albright, attorney.

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

Jill Tangerman, attorney, stated that she is here on behalf of the applicant; this is 3.9 acre tract that was recently annexed to Gahanna, and was approved in May by the County Commissioners, then subsequently accepted in August; the property was in Jefferson Township; in the Township, it was zoned Industrial Warehouse; once it was annexed in it was deemed rural; we are therefore asking that this property be rezoned to the M-1 Zoning category; the property is contiguous to the Crossroads Commerce Center; they have been negotiating with a potential user; the potential user is looking at this site for record storage; nothing has been finalized.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:33 P.M.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

V-0028-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1143.08 (d) - Yard Requirements; for property located at 1068 Cannonade Court; to allow in ground swimming pool in back yard, in a no-build zone; by John A. & Laura R. Dudley, Jr., applicants. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 09/5/02). (Public Held on 09/11/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:35 P.M.

Rick Worth, Attorney for the applicants, John & Laura Dudley, stated that the applicants

have a special situation on their property, mainly a build line that is 15 ft. behind their house; what the applicants want to do is build a nice in-ground swimming pool; the property is adjacent to Route 62; there is a berm on Route 62; my understanding is that the immediate neighbors have an above ground pool on one side, and the other side, the neighbors have planting; the Dudley's submit that this is a necessary and appropriate improvement to their property; asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Canter asked can you expound further on what the special circumstance is. Worth replied that when the plans were laid out, for one reason or another there was a no build zone 15 ft. behind the property; think that the special circumstance is that it is a relatively deep backyard; with the build line situated as it is, the Dudleys are unable to fully enjoy the benefit of their property. Canter asked does both adjoining properties have no-build zones also. Worth replied he believes that is correct. Canter commented that we have to a special circumstance that makes this application unique; the property is labeled no build zone and yet the Dudley's want to place a swimming pool in a no-build zone. Worth stated that is correct. Canter asked again what is the special circumstance. Worth replied the berm at Route 62; the applicants think it is an appropriate addition to the property. O'Hare asked are you aware that there is 10 ft. easement in the backyard. Worth replied yes; however, the pool is not situated on the easement. Peck confirmed that the property on one side has an above ground pool. Worth replied yes, that is my understanding. Spencer asked is the adjoining neighbors pool within the no build zone. Worth replied that he would not be in a position to testify to that question because he has not gone and taken measurements. Greenblott asked so the adjoining property's pool could very well be outside the no build zone. Worth commented that he understands that the Planning Commission has rules; this rules are made for the benefit of the community; my clients believe that building pool will enhance and add to enjoyment of their property; appreciate what zoning codes are. O'Hare stated that he noticed on the photograph that the house at 1066 Cannonade Ct. does not seem to be as large in sq.ft.; asked is the house at 1068 a one-story. Worth replied he believes the house is a one-story. O'Hare commented that the one story house is covering more of the lot than the others because you're setting back the houses about the same.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:42 P.M.

Canter commented that she is unable to support this application for the following reason: in reading or referring to Section 1131.03 defines the process the Planning Commission must go through to grant a variance; the applicant shall present a statement and adequate evidence, in such form as the Planning Commission may require and the Planning Commission shall not grant a variance unless it finds that all of the following conditions apply to the case in question: (a) There are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building, or use referred to in the application; (b) The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; (c) The granting of the application will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood; unable to get the person representing the applicant to identify a special circumstance; don't believe that a pool is required for substantial property rights; the code states substantial property rights, not full property rights; the applicant purchased this beautiful home; they knew they had a no build zone when they purchased the property; the pool is an amenity and a structure.

Peck stated that our variance code is written in the negative; it states that the Planning

Commission shall not grant a variance unless we find out that all the circumstances applies; struggling with application because I do see a special circumstance applying to the land and there is a substantial landscaping mound that serves as a barrier from the significant traffic on Route 62; do see the fact that the mound occupies a significant portion of what is their property; however, don't see the granting of the application will materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood because on this lot, the only vista in terms of protecting the neighborhood is the vista that the people get at driving 35 m.p.h.; with the creation of a pool, it also mandates the creation of a fence which is not allowed in a no build zone; therefore I can't support the variance application.

A motion was made by O'Hare that this matter be Approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

No	4	Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott
Yes	0	

Chair advised applicant of his right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days. Contact the Clerk of Council's office for further information.

FDP-0013-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Biz#2 LTD., to be located at 501 Morrison Road, Suite 102; Biz#2 LTD., by Paul Kolada, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 09/05/02). (Public Hearing held on 9/11/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:46 P.M.

Herman Jones, 170 Brooksedge Drive, Pataskala, OH, stated we are trying to get parking up to current standards for the square feet that we have available; even with adding the additional parking spaces in the front of the building, we will still have about 10 ft. of green space between our parking space and the new Morrison Road; we will also still have more than 5% landscape area; asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Peck commented regarding the 25 ft. aisle width, we have a recommendation from the staff meeting that is held one week prior to the meeting; the Fire Department does not recommend the variance of the aisle width less than 25 ft.; not willing to go against the Fire Department and their recommendation because it is a life/safety issue as Spencer noted in our Committee of the Whole meeting, unless we can get some type of clarification from the Fire Department as to whether they will be able to put the wet stuff on the hot stuff, should something ever happen; asked the Development Department to meet with Brizius to see what is acceptable to the Fire Department; this application will be taken to workshop for September 18th.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

V-0029-2002

To consider a variance application to vary Sections 1167.15(b) - Building Lines Established; 1163.01(a) - Off-Street Parking Space Required; 1163.08(c) - Interior Landscaping Requirements; for property located at 501 Morrison Road, Suite 102; to allow parking setback of less than 36 ft.; drive aisle width of less than 25 ft.; and interior

landscaping of less than 5%; Biz#2 LTD by Paul Kolada, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 09/05/02). (Public Hearing held on 09/11/02).

See discussion on previous application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0061-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 501 Morrison Road; Biz#2, LTD. by Paul P. Kolada, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

FDP-0014-2002

To consider a Final Development Plan for Victory in Pentecost Church, to be located at 542 W. Johnstown Road; Victory in Pentecost Church, by The Covenant Group, James E. Strausbaugh, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in the RFE on 09/05/02). (Public Hearing held on 9/11/02, and 10/23/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:52 P.M.

James E. Strausbaugh, representative from The Covenant Group, 3519 Demington Road, Columbus, OH 43232, stated that the Victory in Pentecost Church is desiring to build a new church facility on their existing property; the existing buildings will remain as they are without any modifications; the facility is designed for 200 parishioners; the parking lot is designed for 67 automobiles. Greenblott asked how many parishioners are presently there. Strausbaugh stated that he would have to refer the question to Pastor Edwards. Pastor Edwards stated there are approximately 80 members at the present time. Peck asked so this Final Development Plan does not change anything on the lot other than to formalize the Final Development Plan in conjunction with the new zoning. Strausbaugh stated the present drive would be incorporated into the new parking area.

Chair asked for Opponents.

Peggy Swingle, 507 Cherry Road, stated that her property is just NE of the property being discussed; don't quite understand what is going to be built there; there is an existing building already there; I have never seen more than about 5 or 6 cars there at a time; my concern mainly is with the sewers and the water in the area; like I said, we are just NE of this property and we do get a lot of drainage from Johnstown Road; we want to know what their plans are for resolving this issue; asked are they building on the same property or are they tearing down the existing building to build a larger building; are they asking to rezone the property that is west of them, that they also own; the property owners in the area do not understand what is going on. Peck commented that the City of Gahanna within the past two years has been faced with the growth of churches, schools, and government facilities in residential areas; all of these facilities have grown over a period of time; when they were built, Gahanna was smaller; Gahanna has now gotten bigger, so we are trying to strike a balance between allowing those various facilities (the schools, churches, and government facilities) to continue to use their property without unduly burdening the adjacent property owners; the Department of Development has worked with Planning Commission and with City Council and has made a modification to the Zoning Code for what we call a Restricted Institution District; so we have many schools and churches in the process of rezoning to the new modifications; this is the first of many that will be done; from that perspective, this would apply to the three parcels that were recommended to Council for rezoning at the last Public Hearing; the zoning on those properties will not be finalized until Council votes on our recommendation; the change to the Restricted Institutional District doesn't really change the current uses that are there; what it does do is put down some guidelines for any future growth and development that may take place, so that the church has an idea of what they can expect as well as the neighbors having an idea of where the boundaries are. Sherwood

commented that the zoning application is scheduled to come before Council on October 7th. Swingle asked regarding the property that is just west of them where there is a house, they are asking to rezone that area also. Peck stated yes that is part of the zoning application ; the zoning application was already advertised and recommended to Council; the zoning itself of that house is not before this evening; we have already voted on that part of it. Strausbaugh stated that the existing structures are staying, but we are proposing a new structure for the use of the church. Spencer asked what will the existing one story house be used for. Strausbaugh replied at the moment it will be unchanged, however, the Pastor has indicated that he would probably use it as part of their teaching facility or something to that effect; but at the moment we don't have any specific plans to renovate it. O'Hare commented that you have on the parking lot plan existing cistern to be filled in; asked is this a storm water cistern. Strausbaugh replied it appears to be cistern from years ago; it is not a part of the storm; there is no storm in that area. O'Hare asked what are you going to do about storm for this large parking lot. Strausbaugh replied that it will have be designed as we prepare the documentation with the City Engineer; this part has not been done. Spencer stated that he would like to see a picture of the existing site. O'Hare stated because of some of the comments in the Staff comments. and hearing what Strausbaugh is saying, there is definitely confusion; assume they are going to light the parking lot; the Commission likes to see the lighting pattern for the lighting. Strausbaugh replied there is one towards the back of the package. Swingle stated to the north of their property there is a lot of woods and dampness back there; we get a lot of water from Johnstown Road; we want to know what is going to go in there; nothing seems to be finalized on what they are going to do. Peck commented to ease your concerns, this matter is not going to be voted on tonight; this matter is going to go to workshop set for next Wednesday; at that time the Planning Commission will sit down with Strausbaugh and hammer out the details and discuss your concerns; as for the drainage concerns that you have, the City Engineer would have to approve this project before the Planning Commission would even look at it; the Planning Commission is not in the position to be able to cure long standing water problems back there; what we are in the position to do is to make sure these improvements don't contribute or aggravate them.

Pastor Edwards, Victory in Pentecost Church, 451 Uxbridge, stated regarding the water problem, there are water circumstances that we deal with; when there is a lot of rain, you do get the retention at the front end of the property where Johnstown Road exists; believe that particular problem will be dealt with in the area that we presently have; don't anticipate any greater problems because we have a total of 7.5 acres of ground in that particular area; we are moving the new building to the south of the existing building, so it will be towards the front of the property away from the homes that are at the back of the property; also I am a property owner there as well at 267 Ballard which is directly adjacent to the existing facility; we are the first ones to experience water problems; at the present time we don't have any water problems. Greenblott asked is number 7 the home that the Pastor is speaking about. Pastor replied as you are facing the church, it is the first house on the right; or if you turn off Johnstown Road onto Ballard, it's the first house on the left.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:07 P.M.

Chair advised that this application will go to workshop on September 18th.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0062-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 542 W. Johnstown Road; by Victory in Pentecost Church, James E. Strausbaugh, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:****DR-0058-2002**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 136 Granville Street; by Master Signs, Mike Held, applicant.

Dr. David Baddour, 186 Broad Street. Pataskala, OH, stated that he is replacing a pre-existing sign; using the same materials; tried to keep lettering the same size and as simple as possible. Greenblott stated that she gets irritated when signs are put up before they are brought to the Planning Commission; the sign looks like you have taken a business card and made it a sign; if this had been taken to workshop, would have said to you "could you give the sign a little pizzazz or something;" now we are faced with a sign that is really not that appealing. Baddour stated that he will be more than happy to make any changes; please excuse me when I say that I really didn't have the energy or time to put forth in designing this sign; this is not my only office; however, I gave this job to Held, and I'm not going to blame him; however, told him that I just wanted to duplicate what the previous sign exhibited; I was under the impression that he would be attending the meetings; we by no means wanted to come into Gahanna and throw our sign up. Peck stated that he appreciated his honesty and candor; however, the sign is a little more cluttered than what we would have approved. Canter asked would be willing to allow Held to give us a couple of options to look at; the sign is just a little too busy. Baddour stated that he understands that these are letters that can just be removed from the sign. Spencer stated that graphically, it is not as appealing as the Commission would like it. Peck commented if you are willing to propose some additional options that would be acceptable to you and the Planning Commission, we could take this application to workshop next Wednesday. Baddour asked would he need to be here only because it is hard to get from the office. Peck stated you could have something that is authorized to speak on your behalf here or you could submit some drawings and let the Planning Commission choose one. Greenblott stated that lining up the letters a little more might even help; Held could do it without a ton of effort. Peck stated there also needs to be 50 sq.ft. of landscape; don't know if that is your problem or Dr. Waters. Canter you decide what you need on the sign and have Held draw it up.

Chair advised that this will be taken to workshop on September 18th

Greenblott asked Chrysler will Held be held responsible. Chrysler stated that he was notified and the sign company did state that they made the sign, but they did not erect the sign. Greenblott stated but even Held making the sign and not coming before Planning Commission, he needs to be cited. Chrysler stated that we can't issue him a citation for making a sign; whoever erected the sign without approval we can cite them.

Discussed**DR-0059-2002**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 146 N. Hamilton Road; by Capital Sign, Paul North, applicant.

Paul North, 10530 Madison Twp., Road 49, Mt. Perry, OH, asked the Commission if they had any questions. Canter asked what is the size of the street panel. North stated that the sign is 21.5 inches high and 96 inches wide. Peck stated that some of the Commission members think the sign band matches and some of us don't; we have come to the consensus that it depends on which direction you are coming from. North stated that they are all dark bronze; some of them are older and might be a little bit faded. Canter stated that southbound they match pretty well; northbound they are a little different. Turely confirmed that this application is for the building sign.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0067-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 146 N. Hamilton Road; Jazzercise by Capital Sign, Paul North, applicant.

Turley confirmed this is for the free standing sign.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

SWP-0010-2002

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to allow a split of 0.493 of acres; for property located on 738 Harrison Pond (Lot 330) - The Park at Harrison Pond "The Villages at Rocky Fork, Section 10, Part 2; EMH&T, Jeff Miller, applicant.

Chair stated that this application has been withdrawn.

Withdrawn

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0063-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 200 Granville Street; Gahanna Lazer Wash by Donald Schofield & Associates, Thomas Grove, applicant.

Thomas Grove, Project Manager from Donald Schofield & Associates, Inc., stated we are planning to renovate this car wash into a two bay self-serve car wash; the biggest change is that we would need to raise the roof so that the automatic equipment can fit in; we are going to keep the brick exterior on the bottom portion of the roof from the gable down; the applicant does want to paint it; the upper portion will be the 4.5 inch dutchlap vinyl siding which will be almond; we will put a brand new truss roof on it and new dimensional asphalt shingles which is more of a black color; the trim will be a Sherwin Williams Lafayette Green; we will have to replace all of the asphalt; we are not going to be paving any more than what is already there; the building footprint is not going to change; we are not going to be adding any square footage to the building; we do have a lighting layout that was done by the electric people; we are using wall fixtures to light up the side; asked Planning Commission if they had any questions.

Canter asked will the facility be unmanned. Grove stated yes; it is a self-serve bay car wash; the only time someone will be at the building is when maintenance is needed; check the trash. O'Hare asked will it be opened 24 hours. Grove replied yes, it will be opened 24 hours a day. O'Hare stated you have a new 6 ft. wood board on board privacy fence in the back. Grove replied the applicant would like to put that in for security purposes between the apartments behind the car wash and the business; plus it will help block the headlights of the cars driving around to the back. O'Hare commented so if I'm coming in off the street, I come around to the back and turn in; put my money into the auto cashier, drive into the automatic bay where it cleans the car; I come out where I have the option of using the vacuum island; how close is the vacuum island to the apartments. Grove replied there are no vacuums on the backside. Canter asked have you had a sound study done as to what the decibels are at the property line. Grove replied no there has not been a sound study done and really don't know what the decibels are. Canter commented that there is noise ordinance, so you would want to make sure that you are within those guidelines. O'Hare commented that the Planning Commission would really like to see the sound study. Spencer asked on the openings of the bay, are you implying that there is not a door there. Grove replied that is correct, there are no doors; right now there are garage doors on the bays and they will be removed; it will

always be opened. Spencer asked what happens in the winter time. Grove stated that the floor has a radiant floor heating system in it so that the water will never freeze; the pipes are all insulated. Spencer commented if it is 10 degrees below zero outside, the floor will not freeze. Grove replied that the manufacturer Harold's Equipment has not had any problems with pipes freezing; there is a heated pad 25 ft. from the building that will catch any drips as the cars comes out of the bay. Spencer asked what about security for 24 hours. Grove replied that the owner is planning on installing a security monitor system that will document any security issues or vandalism of the equipment. O'Hare asked has your firm designed one of these radiant heater pads before. Grove stated that our company does not design them, they come from the heating manufacturer; it is a piping system. O'Hare stated that he has concerns about this for the following reason; have seen people put the piping system in and they don't take into account the cracking of the concrete; therefore you have the concrete cracking about two years down the line.

Chair stated that this application will be taken to workshop on September 18th.

Discussed

DR-0064-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 3868 Stygler Road; Gahanna Free Will Baptist Church by All Star Signs, James Waller, applicant.

James Waller, All Star Signs, 112 S. Glenwood Avenue, stated that they will be taking down the old sign and putting up a new one.

Greenblott asked who is doing the stone base. Waller replied someone in the church will be doing the stone base.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0065-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 1250 Hamilton Road; US Bank by Lighting Maintenance, Jim Reed, applicant.

Jim Reid stated he has been asked by MC Sign Company to obtain a permit and install sign for US Bank.

Greenblott asked when you remove the FirStar sign, will everything be covered up in terms of any holes. Reid yes the holes will be covered up; in fact they were asking me if I knew anyone locally that could fill the holes.

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

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and Greenblott

DR-0066-2002

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 140 N. Hamilton Road; Muzotech, Inc. by A. Tech Signs and Graphics, Tom Mager, applicant.

Mike Kendrick, 607 Whitethorne Avenue, Columbus, OH. stated we originally had not intended to slide the panels in; however, we ended up doing it; the gentleman that works for me, dealt with Muzeau; originally we were going to do the two panels and do a couple of signs for the inside of the building and Muzeau would put them up himself; however, the gentleman that works for me, Tom decided we would do the job; we thought we used the same pantone colors as the colors that were up there.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Turley that this matter be Approved. The motion

carried by the following vote:

Yes 4 Chairman Peck, Vice Chairman Turley, O'Hare and
Greenblott

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole

Chair advised that he met with City Attorney Tom Weber regarding our Fence Code; Weber will meeting with the Commission on next Wednesday to discuss what is a fence, what is a structure, etc.

Gahanna Jefferson Joint Committee - Canter - No Report

Creekside Development Team - Greenblott.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney - No Report

City Engineer - No Report

Department of Development - No Report

Chair.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - No Report

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

L. ADJOURNMENT - 9:00 P.M.

TANYA M. WORD
Deputy Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

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

Chair Signature