

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 14, 1999

8:00 PM

Council Committee Rooms

Committee of the Whole

*Debra A. Payne, Chairman
Karen J. Angelou
Sherie James-Arnold
L. Nicholas Hogan
Thomas R. Kneeland
Rebecca W. Stinchcomb
Robert W. Kelley, ex officio*

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES:

Dave Haney, City Telecommunications Consultants; Thomas G. St. Pierre, AEP; Stanley J. Sagun, Columbia Gas; Jim McGregor, Ernest Choung, Sadicka White.

ISSUES

Members Absent: Robert W. Kelley

Members Present: Debra A. Payne, Sherie James-Arnold, Rebecca W. Stinchcomb, Thomas R. Kneeland, L. Nicholas Hogan and Karen J. Angelou

990260

Utility Right of Way Legislation

Payne welcomed visitors to the meeting and asked for their comments. St. Pierre recapped what contracts have come to be in Columbus, Worthington and Westerville.

Haney stated that House Bill 283, which is the budget bill, has attached to it a provision that would prohibit cities from passing the type of legislation we are considering; have spoken with E J Thomas and will be attending the conference committee hearings this week.

Haney reviewed documentation attached to this ordinance with regard to the method used to determine recoverable costs; stated the document would need to be shared with AEP, Columbus Gas, Ameritech, Time Warner, Insight Communications, and Ameritech New Media for their comments prior to any Council action.

Payne requested that this document be distributed to Council for discussion at next Committee of the Whole. Also requested copies go to AEP and Columbia Gas since they are present this evening. After further review by Council, will distribute to balance of utilities for their input.

Held in Committee**980526**

MOTION RESOLUTION TO REFER TO PLANNING COMMISSION A REVIEW OF CHANGES TO CHAPTER 1171, FENCES, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES.

Payne stated we need to move forward with this; make a decision and remove from agenda or prepare and pass legislation. Discussion centered on fence height; current fence code 1171.05 and building code 1325.08 requires for pools fences of at least 36" but not greater than 72" for in ground pools; 42" for above ground pools with a locking gate. Several alternatives were discussed ranging from 6' for all fences to a minimum height of 42". Discussion was held concerning civic association pools vs. commercial pools vs. residential pools vs. hotel pools. Hogan commented our major pools all have 6' fences. Stinchcomb stated that Foxboro also has a cover whereas Hunters Ridge and JLSR Recreation Council do not; felt it had been determined that for community pools it would be virtually impossible to afford a cover; personally feel we should be asking apartment complexes to cover; feel we need to ask for that; feel that is the area there is the greatest liability; don't see many accidents in residential or at community pools; some level of supervision there. Hogan felt we should be discussing a fence or a pool cover of sufficient capability to withstand a certain weight. Stinchcomb stated that covers have their own issues; could do a 42" high fence minimum and strongly recommend for multi family that they have a cover but fence is required. Angelou stated she would like to see us to go 48" and a substantial cover during off season.

Payne requested that the last draft be resurrected and look at the wording again; don't

think grandfathering should be included as this is a safety issue. Discussion again centered on commercial vs civic association; suggested wording of AR zoned pools; also suggested for commercial and community pools that any pool this is swim at your own risk. Kneeland noted we have been centered on apartment pools but soon will have issue of hotel pools. Other suggestions included:

1. 48" fence and a cover for AR and commercial.
2. 6' fence for civic association pools. Discussion held on terminology and McGregor suggested pools within commercial and AR zoning districts.
3. If you have 48" fence you would be required to have a cover. With a 6' fence you would not be required to have a cover.

Angelou noted that representative from Apartment Association shared national statistics that most accidents are at private homes. Discussion held on complexes that allow access from areas than a gated fence; ie laundry rooms or community buildings of complexes. White stated she felt we were after legislation that would be concerned with entrance from outside and could be considered an attractive nuisance; if they enter from inside then property owner would be at fault not us; looking at being able to keep people from being able to get in from outside. Stinchcomb noted that more responsible complexes have covers for the off season.

Was noted that any change to commercial and AR should allow for input from local apartment complexes before we move forward. Payne requested that legislation be pulled together for next Committee of the Whole for review; after one more Council review will send to apartment complexes for input.

Held in Committee

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC/AAE, Deputy Clerk of Council, reporting