

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 26, 2013

7:00 PM

City Hall

Planning Commission

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

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 June 26, 2013. Chair Don Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Tom Weber, Assistant City Attorney; agenda for this meeting was published on June 21, 2013.

Members Absent: David B. Thom

Members Present: Donald R. Shepherd, David K. Andrews, Jennifer Tisone Price, Kristin E. Rosan, Joe Keehner and Thomas J. Wester

B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None.**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting June 12, 2013.**

A motion was made by Andrews, seconded by Wester, to approve the minutes of the June 12, 2013 Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes **6** Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent **1** Thom

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.

CU-0003-2013

To consider a Conditional Use application to allow a 3.93 acre portion of the parcel to be used for Agricultural purposes; 500 North Hamilton Road; Franklin County Board of Developmental Disabilities, Dorothy Yeager, applicant. (Advertised in RFE 3/21/13)

A motion was made by Keehner, seconded by Andrews, that this matter be Postponed to Date Certain to the Planning Commission July 24, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent **1** Thom

Yes **6** Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

V-0005-2013

To consider a Variance Application to vary 1171.03(b) of the codified ordinances of the City of Gahanna; to allow a fence to exceed 6' in height; for property located at 500 North Hamilton Road; Franklin County Board of Developmental Disabilities, Dorothy Yeager, applicant. (Advertised in RFE 3/21/13)

A motion was made by Keehner, seconded by Andrews, that this matter be Postponed to Date Certain to the Planning Commission July 24, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes **6** Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent **1** Thom

V-0009-2013

To consider a Variance Application to vary Section 1141.08(c) of the codified ordinances of the City of Gahanna; to allow an accessory structure to encroach into the side yard; for property located at 126 Walcreek Drive East; Alex Morrow, applicant.

(Advertised in RFE 6/20/13)

Gard said from the picture you can see some of the concrete patio build-ins existing now; the patio wraps around this area; the proposed pergola would cover at least a portion of the built in furniture and cooking area that exists there now; the clearance would be 7' rather than the 10' that is required by the SF-2 code; would be encroaching approximately 3' from the existing fence.

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

Alex Morrow, 126 Walcreek Dr. E., said we took possession of this house nearly four years ago; there is a multiple tiered decking system with a built in fire place in the decking and a hot tub; it was in disrepair and needed to be replaced so we removed all the decking material and put in a patio and removed almost everything else and put in a vegetable garden; where we want to put the pergola is basically where the existing structure was located and within the same height with the existing structure and the fire place; would like to enclose that area with this pergola to provide shade and limit the energy usage to the sun room that is attached to the house.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Morrow said he contacted the neighbor that is adjacent to the property and they said they are happy to have this addition to the neighborhood, along with the other neighborhood residents.

Price said I have a question in regard to the former footprint; the aerial photo still shows the multi tiered decking; the new patio you put in, is it basically over that same footprint, or did it expand? Morrow said it is basically the same footprint; there is a path that goes along the fence line and we left that in so you are still able to walk around the edge of the patio area and where the decking was there was a path there. Price said so when you purchased the house was the deck already in the setback. Morrow said correct. Price said so you basically replaced the wood with concrete; Morrow said yes.

Rosan said it appears that part of the kitchen area is within the setback as well; why is that not included in the variance. Gard said concrete is not a structure. Rosan said so this is requiring a variance because it is wood and not concrete. Gard said yes and there are overhead members.

Chair closed the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.

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

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent 1 Thom

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

2013-0021

To remand to Planning Commission, ORD-0091-2013, Meadowbrooke Subdivision - ROD/SF3 zoning; to permit a reconfiguration of the site plan recommended to Council for approval by Planning Commission on April 10, 2013; for property located at 5593 Havens Corners Road.

Gard said this is the revised site plan that you will be considering tonight.

David Hodge, Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad St., attorney for Brookewood; said I'll be

very brief; the applicant in hearing some of the concerns through the Planning Commission process, Council and neighbors, has decided to reduce the density of the subdivision by one lot; the most noticeable difference is in the southeast corner down around lot 8; it did have the narrow entry drive; the request is down from 14 lots to 13; that reduces the overall density of the entire subdivision, including lot 9 to 2.9 units per acre; it's 3.3 units per acre excluding lot 9; the space saved has generally been spread around the lots, so the lots were an average of 60' in width, and now they are 65' in width; the average square footage increased by about 600 sq. ft.; it also allowed us to extend that no build zone on the east side and extend it clear down to the southern property line; it also allowed for the house on lot 8 to be shifted to the west which helps address concerns by Mr. Olsen; we had a discussion with Mr. Olsen in the hall after Council committee meeting so this change goes a long way toward addressing his concerns; there were, in the previous plan, 5 lots that were adjacent to the homes to the south, under this plan there are now 3; overall there is less impervious surface which goes to the stormwater and helps there; the subdivision is still going to have a positive impact on the surrounding properties; generally my experience in attending meetings like this a couple of times a week over the last 12 years has shown me that this process works; when you come to Planning Commission and address concerns and listen to the neighbors and make modifications based on their concerns, when you work through the process it works; this plan this evening is superior to the plan that was sent on to Council by your positive vote of 5 to 2, and we respectfully request that this plan also be sent on to Council with a positive recommendation.

Wester said on the right hand side of the drawing it says aid underground exfiltration trench or equal; what is equal? Hodge said that was shown on the previous plan, and what that means is that stormwater mitigation feature can be a grass swale, or it can be gravel, which allows the stormwater to permeate down to the surface; those are engineering details and we have worked on these details extensively; hopefully to mitigate your concern; the text that is part of this application commits to review and approval not only by your City Engineer, but also by FSWCD, with whom we met and coordinated all of this with. Wester said there will be review by the City Engineer to determine like what is an equal to grass bottom detention basin in regard to performance, maintainability and sustainability. Hodge said to answer your question there is review and approval by the City Engineer, there is review by FSWCD and there will be an HOA formed to maintain this which is common in every subdivision that has this kind of feature. Wester said on lots 10 and 11 there was slope protection proposed initially; landscape terrace or equal; the new site plan doesn't have that. Hodge said I think there was a retaining wall or some such shown on the plan that was never committed to in any text; the plan got to be pretty busy so that was removed from the plan at my request, but if a retaining wall or something else is necessary to accommodate a structure on either lot 10 or 11 it will certainly be there. Wester said the contours have not changed so I don't understand the logic.

Price said I would like to have a better understanding of "or equal"; what would be some examples of substitutions that could be made; instead of grass bottom detention it might mean what; can you give a couple of examples. Hodge said he would like to defer to the City Engineer who would have a more professional answer to the question. Wetherholt said I think the intent on having "or equal" is when it comes to the actual construction plans for the subdivision the Engineering department is going to do an extensive review of whatever the final plan is and we are going to look at this particularly with sustainability in mind and reducing a maintenance exposure to the City; so to me saying "or equal", approved equal means the flexibility gets transferred on to our review when we are actually reviewing the construction plans. Price said so this is pretty much the norm for lots of projects; you look at it once the project is finally under way. Wetherholt

said yes, in general we are in favor of the green infrastructure, the bioswales and so forth, but at the same time there is potential for many of these items to have some City exposure and review on a periodic basis so because of that we are going to be looking at them critically on how that goes; we believe that we have come up with something that is going to work, but we have not quite gotten to the point where we are seeing construction plans yet. Price said so are you saying it is pretty much standard to have "or equal". Wetherholt said you usually don't see that on a plan that is at the Planning Commission level; when it gets to our level it is going to be pinned down and more exact.

Keehner said my views about this haven't changed radically; topography wise combining 10 and 11 would have made more sense than the reconfiguration on the south side of the property; my understanding is that if this does not get approved it reverts to the previous plan with the 15 lots. Weber said that is correct. Keehner said all of the innovative stormwater mitigation is still in place, and Hodge said yes it is. Keehner continued that in some respects this does make more sense; to have slightly less runoff on the south side which also has some slope going into the creek; the major run off area is still 2 lots which aesthetically and spatially it would have made more sense to have one house on those 2 lots next to the existing house, but if you think you can sell those little lots; that's where most of the trees are at too; will have to cut down much of the tree cover and the major swale that takes runoff water from the whole site; that to me is a major issue in terms of the environmental aspect of it; but if I have to choose between this plan and the one before that was sent to Council, I would have to choose the plan you are bringing forth tonight; my issues are the same in terms of density and smaller lots.

Hodge said we listened to you and had the land planner stay up till about 2:30 a.m. one night to look at a plan that did just that on 10 and 11; we compared the plans, and there is give and take, and we decided that this plan that was submitted did more for more people and that is why we came back with this plan. Keehner said I know you have to coddle neighbors and saving those trees on the east side probably isn't as big of a deal as saving the trees on the west side, but it is problematic moving into a subdivision and they don't know what will be on the property next to them; that is a gamble any time you move into a subdivision; I could probably say okay to this one over the previous one, but I still have the same concerns.

Hodge said I understand, and that is a perfect summary of why we are here tonight; we would prefer to go ahead with this plan; it does mitigate some of the concerns raised throughout this process; is an effort at compromise; is a step in the right direction and the plan we prefer to take back to Council.

Andrews said I also echo what Keehner said; I didn't like the little driveway thing on lot 8 that went back, so I do appreciate you getting rid of that; I was one of the people who voted against it last time along with Keehner; I do feel that my hands are kind of tied; still not a lover of the plan; I still think it is way too many houses for this plot of land; I feel for the neighbors; I'm still concerned about the drainage issue; some of it is experimental and we have to see what happens; but if I say no it goes back to the 15 which I think is a big mistake.

Discussion on motion. Rosan said I will be supporting the revision; I think once again the developer has improved the plan further; have a lot of feedback from the property owners to the south and the fact remains now that there are only 3 rather large lots that are going to be along the Souder Ealy Ditch and adjacent to those property owners and I think that is a really great improvement, so I will be supporting the application tonight.

Wester said I will be supporting this tonight also, but I do have to agree with Keehner and Andrews that my original concerns were with topography, traffic and drainage but I do believe they are being addressed.

A motion was made by Andrews, seconded by Rosan, to recommend to Council approval of the revised plan for Meadowbrooke currently before Council which includes a reconfiguration of the site plan down to 13 new lots and a revised overlay text to correspond with the revised site plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent 1 Thom

DR-0013-2013

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage for Hunters Ridge Mall; to move the existing cabinet up, to install one new sign and two mounting cover replacements; property located at 304-368 North Hamilton Road; Bri Bailey/Sign Vision, applicant.

A motion was made by Wester, seconded by Andrews, that this matter be Postponed to Date Certain to the Planning Commission July 10, 2013. The motion carried by the following vote:

Absent 1 Thom

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

DR-0014-2013

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for a fence for an outdoor patio area; for property located at 395 Stoneridge Lane; Alumni Club Bar & Grille, V.F.S., Inc., applicant.

Gard said the questions from the previous meeting have been answered; Castro says the patio has to be removable; will be the same style fence as Piada; Board of Liquor Control will not put anything in writing, but they have relaxed their requirement that the main door has to be fenced; they will not review until after the patio is in; will be signage posted no alcohol beyond this point; they also have a copy of the police code concerning smoking.

Brian Jacobs, 415 Denwood Dr. S., and Rick McGinley, 4600 Hunting Creek Dr. said Gard did a good job describing what had happened since the last meeting; do feel we have answered everything the Commission asked.

There was discussion about putting a condition of one year on the variance to see how things work out, and Jacobs and McGinley said that is fine. Weber said you can do that. Price thanked the applicants for addressing all of the Commission's concerns.

A motion was made by Price, seconded by Rosan, that this matter be Approved with the condition that the variance is for one year from the date of construction inspection by the Planning & Zoning Administrator, and then the applicant will come back to the Commission for review. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent 1 Thom

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0015-2013

To consider a Certificate for Appropriateness for site plan, landscaping, building design and signage; for Jefferson Township #2 School (1860 One Room School); for property located at 515 Havens Corners Road; Gahanna Jefferson Public Schools; Jan Elzey, applicant.

Gard said this is an area map; this is the portion of the high school, and this is Lincoln Elementary; request is to reconstruct the deconstructed one room school house on this site; showed picture of the condition the school was in before it was taken down; also showed picture of an old one room school in Johnstown that has been restored which will be similar to this one; will have shutters and a bell tower on the top; have a historical rendering of how it might have looked today; the location is to the side of the playground; will have a granite marker on front identifying it; will be open to the public for special tours; will have specific hours; will be a split rail fence around it and landscaping, and a paved path that goes up to the entry.

Jan Elzey, 6223 Brooksong Way, representing GJPS, said the building was taken down brick by brick and stored; originally were going to reconstruct it by MSS, but decided this is a better area; will use the restrooms at the football field for visitors; we have 24 third grade classes in Gahanna; want each class to spend a day at the school with the school marm; will encourage them to dress from the period; had hoped to have it done before school starts, but probably will not be ready then.

Andrews said it is owned by Gahanna schools, and Elzey said yes, but paid for from donations received; had the little boxes with a school on them to collect funds; have collected \$64,000; will have slate roof, pot belly stove, bell tower, hickory floors; will be a little larger than the original building because we have to have 20 sq. ft. per student; we are using the old front door but adding 6" to bring up to code; plans have been drawn up by the architect and stamped; there will be no outside lighting; will be putting a wood fence around the building when the project is finished. After question from Price, Elzey said he feels it will certainly be open to other school districts.

Andrews said it will be beautiful and is such a great idea. Price said it is amazing how it was moved and will be reconstructed. Elzey said this has been Tom Gregory's vision and he deserves to be commended for that, I am just here as representative tonight.

Keehner said it looks like a stone lentel over the front door, and it will accommodate the expanded door. Elzey said yes; at some point the building was converted into a garage and there was a 16' X 8' garage door there so all the brick in the front is gone; will be purchasing brick but it is not new brick; we had to get additional slate for the roof and we got that from an old barn; basically the bell tower, the windows and the door and maybe 60% of the brick and 80% of the slate will be original.

Rosan said the existing site has a chain link fence, will that remain. Elzey said that will be the first thing to come down; there will be a wooden fence around the old school; will be an area that is 40' X 60' that will be closed off; want to separate it from the rest of the area; want to make it a site that stands alone; will be landscaping.

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

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent 1 Thom

DR-0016-2013

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for building design to add two exterior sunrooms to the north end of the existing Northeast School; for property located at 500

North Hamilton Road; Franklin County Board of Developmental Disabilities; Ford & Associates Architects, Gayle Zimmerman, applicant.

Gard said the Young Adult Services program is currently sponsored by Good Will and is across the street from the Northeast School; will be moving the young adult program into the Northeast School to continue their program there; the proposed new rooms are life skill rooms that will be set up like a home; will have a kitchen and living room, and whatever else you would have in an apartment; what they would like to do is add two sun rooms, one on each side of the building at the northern most portion of the building; they are 213 sq. ft. mirror images on each side; they will have their own entry point.

Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects, 1500 W. 5th Ave., Columbus, and Dorothy Yeager representing FCBDD, 2879 Johnstown Road; said Gard did a great job summarizing what we are trying to do there; sure they will enjoy having more sun in the building area where they will be.

Andrews said you are doing a lot of things with the building and with Sun Apple; great that you are always working to improve things; I think it's great. Yeager said we like to maximize our facilities and it is a very attractive location.

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

Yes **6** Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent **1** Thom

DR-0017-2013

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for building design and signage for renovation of existing building for new Family Dollar Store; for property located at 459 Agler Road; Family Dollar Stores Inc.; Atwater Group, Nick Stratigakes, applicant.

Gard said this is the area map; here is Agler Rd.; there are existing conditions that are not pretty; furniture store has not been in business for a long time; Family Dollar currently occupies space next to this building; this is what Family Dollar is proposing to do; they will put in a new store front with double doors; paint the back side of the building; paint shingles; change color and add new dock area and new signage.

Jordan Liss, Atwater Group, Chicago; said we are looking to relocate the existing Family Dollar store that is in this same shopping center; want to relocate to this store that is currently vacant; want a larger store; the plan for the project is to do some minor exterior modification and interior renovation and resealing and striping the parking lot.

Andrews asked if the shingle were going to be repainted? Liss said I do not know that for sure. Andrews said they should be; I live on that side of town and this shopping center is horrible; I'm ashamed of it; the back of the building is a mess; when I do go into Family Dollar the outside is always a mess; it doesn't look like Gahanna; I'm for it but you are going to have to do a whole lot more to improve that building because it looks horrible; the whole shopping center is disgusting; I'm glad you are expanding; that is good for Gahanna but you have got to do a lot more improvements.

Rosan said were you provided a copy of the Zoning Administrators staff report. Liss said yes. Rosan said is your client or the developer willing to make the additional improvements listed by the Zoning Administrator. Liss said which improvements. Rosan read the additional improvements listed by the Zoning Administrator; paint existing shingles; clean brick facades; parking lot appropriately striped and signed for HC parking; parking lot free of any potholes; parking lot lighting improved and upgraded; screening the 3 proposed dumpsters; numerous violations of junk logged and

trash at the rear of the current Family Dollars store location; existing gravel in the dock area at the rear of the building kept free from potholes and ruts; landscaping installed on site to approve curb appeal.

Liss said we do plan to fix the pavement in the parking lot and restripe; landscaping I'm not sure where we can install landscaping, it is mostly impervious. Rosan asked if the developer is purchasing the parcel, and Liss said yes. Rosan said so the developer will own not only the 10,000 sq. ft. proposed site but the adjacent building, and Liss said yes. Rosan said so Family Dollar is going to own this as well as the adjacent vacant space in between the existing Family Dollar store and the new Family Dollar store, is that correct. Liss said yes. They are going to take the western portion of the furniture store and then the eastern portion of the furniture store is going to remain vacant. Gard said that is not my understanding. Wester and Rosan said that is what the drawing says. Liss said the vacant space could be leased in the future. Rosan said the improvements that you are suggesting, are they for the entire former furniture store or just for the 10,000 sq. ft.; Liss said the exterior improvements would be for the Family Dollar store portion, the remaining space would be upgraded when a new tenant moves in there. Rosan said I am going to recommend that this go to workshop; if the developer doesn't have a copy of the staff review I suggest you get one; what I would like to hear at workshop is the developer's position on those recommendations and then above and beyond that I would like to see some plan for addressing the remaining portion of the building that is not going to be part of Family Dollar but is being acquired by the developer; to elaborate on that it may be a poor choice to make this type of improvement for the new 10,000 sq. ft. while leaving the other half of the furniture store in the state of disrepair that it is currently in; it makes more sense if you are going to be doing facade improvements to make all of those improvements at one time; makes sense to do all of the exterior work now. Liss said facade is really limited to the painting of the back wall. Rosan said it shouldn't be that big of a deal to make those improvements for the entire building that the developer is acquiring, regardless of where Family Dollar is going to be.

Shepherd said develop the whole site so it looks nice; have you been by the site. Liss said I have not. Commission members suggested Liss go by the site. Shepherd said the paint is coming off on the west side, it is almost stripped off of the shingles; get out of your car and walk around to the back; the loading dock is crumbling; you really couldn't use it; along with painting that whole area is going to need to be improved; it's in bad shape, along with the drive back there; there are holes probably 8" to 10" deep; know we are asking for a lot of things, but it is to the point that it is embarrassing how that building has been kept; so on July 17th we will hear the application in workshop. Weber said you need a motion to postpone the application until after the workshop; the next regular meeting would be the 24th. Chair said any questions you have can go to Zoning Administrator Gard.

A motion was made by Rosan, seconded by Wester, that this matter be Postponed to Date Certain to the Planning Commission July 24, 2013 meeting with a workshop on July 17th. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Shepherd, Andrews, Price, Rosan, Wester and Keehner

Absent 1 Thom

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Attorney.

City Engineer.

Department of Development.

Chair.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Andrews wished everyone a happy 4th of July.

L. ADJOURNMENT: 8:03 p.m.; Motion by Rosan.

Donna L. Jernigan, MMC
Senior Deputy Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Planning Commission, this
day of 2013.*

Chair Signature