

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 12, 2000

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, July 12, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 7, 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:**

MOTION by Smith, seconded by Canter, to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2000 meeting. ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Smith, Canter, Greenblott, Mullin, Thom, Turley, Peck. Motion carried.

MOTION by Smith, seconded by Canter, to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2000 meeting. ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Smith, Canter, Greenblott, Mullin, Thom, Turley, Peck. Motion carried.

D. HEARING OF VISITORS - ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: None.**E. APPLICATIONS:**

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

FDP-0009-2000

To consider a final development plan to allow for the construction of a warehouse building; for property located at 715 Science Blvd; John Ingwersen by Columbus Consulting, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/8/2000)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m.

John Ingwersen, 1050 Bryden Road, Columbus, stated he was present representing the applicant; wish to construct a 12,000 sf office warehouse; been through several meetings and workshops; result of last workshop was the addition of 5 pine trees to further screen loading dock area; supplied an updated landscape plan for distribution to you and for the record; made building a darker grey as indicated on the updated data sheet supplied last week; believe the building will be a nice addition to Science Blvd. and look forward to your approval.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Turley confirmed that the newest plan reflects the changes discussed. Ingwersen agreed that it contained everything discussed.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Peck stated that over time this has changed greatly; original form called for

truck doors facing Science; applicant worked with Planning Commission to realign and put docks on landfill side; will make much less visual impact on industrial park; greatly improve the landscaping; can support this application.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

A motion was made, seconded by Canter, to approve FDP-09-2000 as submitted July 5, 2000. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

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

DR-0037-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a warehouse building.

See discussion on previous application.

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

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

Z-0010-2000

To consider a zoning change application to rezone 32.952 acres from ER-1 to L-AR, Limited Overlay Apartment Residential; for property located at 5099-5145 Morse Road; Triangle Real Estate Services, Inc., by Glen Dugger, applicant.

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

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, stated he was present representing the applicant; this item has been discussed a number of times most recently in workshop; are a couple of minor housekeeping issues and then talk about open space dedication; first in your text there is a typo error on page 2, under Building elevations, item (c) change "and a" to "are"; second is that we had indicated we were providing an easement to properties owned by Stanson and New Albany Company; on latest plat that easement is shown in the wrong location; easement is not in front of the homes on those properties but behind the home; intent of discussion was that we would not violate the Morse Road setback; as originally discussed easement would be located stubbing in from east and west for development of those two parcels; we will make change on final development plan; implication is that easement would provide access to houses which, from a redevelopment standpoint, is not the goal of the city or us; the most important and substantive concern still open is the open space dedication issue; we had provided that there would be two areas of open space dedication - 2.9 acres along Beem Creek for preservation and the southern leg of the Evans tract; necessary for open space goals of the city; that was worked out between Development staff and my client before I got involved; we have provided 150' of open space setback on Morse Road; cumulative sum of those is that the Beem Creek setback and the area off Morse Road gets us to minimum threshold on open space dedication; City essentially has a windfall opportunity of obtaining property on Johnstown Road over and above; cover that fairly briefly; in the event Riva Ridge connector comes to fruition the City needs this property; this meets the open space provisions of the code; is some linguistic housekeeping we need to do as well; glad to answer any questions; let opponents have their time.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

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

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Turley noted that items discussed in workshop were taken care of; a bikeway easement along southern boundary is shown; southern vehicular entry along proposed Riva Ridge extension is also shown; some agreements were made with neighboring residents to preserve pine trees on western border as well as additional mounding and plant material on western edge of Stanson site; wording changes were made to limited text to clarify numbers on final number of units; also allowing changes in architecture at the Design Review stage; one other topic that will be addressed at Final Development Plan stage is a walkway/bikeway easement along Beem Ditch; will be supporting this zoning change because it is compatible with land use, compatible with North Triangle Plan and topography, and access and traffic flow issues have been addressed.

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

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

A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Canter, to recommend to Council the acceptance of 2.9 acres known as Beem Creek and the 2.0 parcel comprised of the southern leg of the Evans property. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Dugger noted that while these items were percolating at Council, would like to proceed to file the elements of the Final Development Plan, building elevations, etc., so we can start working on this; want the time to be able to reach closure; know that it would be out of sequence with your normal procedures; in this instance, given concern Board had about those two elements, feel we need to start as soon as we can; will most likely be prior to final approval by Council.

HOP-0003-2000

To consider a home occupation permit to allow a Type A Home Day Care; for property located at 5625 Havens Corners Road; current zoning ER-2; Elizabeth Colbert, applicant. (Public Hearing).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Elizabeth Colbert, 1461 Oxbow Drive, Blacklick, stated she was a partner and am here representing the resident of 5625 Havens Corners who is seeking a Type A home day care license; I am funding this project; she will run and operate it; will be an after school tutoring enrichment program for school age children only; using 6 centers for enrichment in math, science, performing arts, arts & crafts, etc. and the fact it provides day care as well is a bonus; is a concept we would like to try in a small scope without a lot of investment ; try for a year and will be limited to 12 students; if concept works and program works, then we will be seeking a commercial location; this would be a test concept and would allow us to see if it will work; do have program concept; do have a BS in Education but don't practice; Ms. Parks has been my nanny for several years; is well received by teachers and a lot of our friends; would like to give this a try.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Canter asked why Colbert was applying when the home is leased. Colbert stated the home is leased in her name and Ms. Parks resides there. In response to question, Colbert stated that a Type A license allows a maximum of 12 children; have applied for only school age; younger children lowers the numbers. Canter stated that home occupations are to be that; only allows the residents of the home to conduct the business; if the lease is in your name you are the only one allowed. Colbert stated that Parks will

be running the business and she resides on premises; my only part is in funding and helping her to test the concept; she would be the only person except when we have a performer come in for a session on the performing arts or someone to do another type of demonstration; the only time I will be there will be to do some paperwork and financing issues; she is running the business. Canter stated her concern is that this is more business like than a home occupation; with a home occupation you shouldn't know anything is going on in the home; talking 12 children of school age being tutored; don't see how this use can be subordinate to the residence; where will they be in the home. Colbert stated there are 3 rooms on the 1st floor; will be doing homework there with resource material available; she will move from room to room to tutor. Canter reiterated that if you walk into this home and you see desks and a setup that appears like a school, then it is not a home; home occupation is subordinate to the residential use; with an incidental home occupation going on you would never notice it; is a very involved operation and sounds like an excellent concept but we have to stay within guidelines of the code.

Thom asked if they had a Type A license. Colbert noted that the State was waiting on the permission of this board; have to have this in place before final approval is given.

Peck stated they have spent the money on the license but State won't make a decision until this process is complete; questioned age group; from kindergarten on up; what about middle school and up. Colbert stated it was designed for elementary age.

Thom noted last paragraph which says that occupancy will be no more than 12 for weekend; could grow up to 36 with 6 adult tutors. Colbert stated that was potential growth and would not be in this location; would be a limit of 12 at this location; want to test the concept here; if successful will move to a commercial center. In response to question, Colbert stated they have filed for a Type S Corporation; in this location it won't be for profit; just enough to pay the bills; but won't lose a lot of money jumping into this concept; still has a viable means of support.

Canter asked about hours of operation. Colbert stated it would be after school to 6:00 p.m. and weekend hours with no more than 6 kids; will be same hours on weekend; may be an occasional overnight stay but very rarely. Thom questioned state requirements on staff. Colbert stated it is by age; school age has a ratio of 1 to 18; if they are younger, then can be no more than 6; toddlers etc. is different again. Thom noted text also talked about weekend camping activities; bonfires in the backyard. Colbert noted that terminology of day care can have a negative connotation for baby sitting; camp or enrichment center sounds more enticing for the children; if parents want to do something on weekends they can by using this enrichment facility for their children; guilt free day care.

Turley noted that one of the restrictions for home occupations is that it shall not exceed 500 sf or % of total square footage; 3 big rooms would exceed 25% of the gross floor area; if that was the only use for her living room, one bedroom, and kitchen area. Colbert agreed if those three rooms were totally dedicated; but they won't be totally dedicated.

Peck stated that as an attorney even if using den as office can't use more than 500 sf of my room for my law practice exclusively; just says area dedicated for; is the use and that's in keeping with the tone of the first requirement that says subordinate to residential uses. Colbert stated she did not disagree; time is a factor; only talking about 3 hours or so to make sure books are in order; time is not dominant; licensing board is

having a hard time fitting this in to a category also.

Canter asked White if she chose to baby sit school age children in home and had 6 children under whatever state requirement is, are we required to come to you to get a Home Occupation Permit. White stated according to Gahanna's code you can't do without a permit; other areas specify 5 unrelated children; can do just requires the permit. In response to question from Greenblott, Colbert stated that the computer dedicated to the business is in the residence; assume I will need to spend several hours each week updating records and doing the books. Greenblott stated that becomes an issue for a Home Occupation Permit as the conditions state that all home occupations shall be conducted only by family members residing on the premises; appears to be more of a business that is dealing with unrelated people; is very muddy. Colbert stated she understands that; Parks has been my nanny for all 7 of my children; this was to help her get established as I no longer need her services; am spending time training her on how to run a business; don't want to be a negative; trying to be very up front; could be a viable program; lets us test the market; do on a full time basis without any large scale costs.

Thom noted we are talking about a Type A home day care center; sort of trying to see this as a school use too; are we under some different guidelines; schools must have conditional use. White stated in ER-1 it would be considered a conditional use; ER-2 it is not there at all; appears that the proper zoning category would be ER-1 which is general property area of 5 acres; still required by state to be licensed; more than 5 unrelated children requires a license; her particular case dealing with school age they are much more lenient. Colbert stated this was new to her and new to the state; is a new concept in day care; trying this and providing a service.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Peck stated he had several concerns; want to express appreciation for forthrightness of applicant; not trying to hide anything; believe in the right circumstances this may be a viable business concept; but we ultimately have to look at it as a business; Chapter 1177 of the code governing home occupations; look at Section 1177.01, Purpose; next look at Section 1177.05 which says we can only approve if certain criteria are met; not convinced that it meets any of the 4 criteria; Section 1177.05(c) says we shall deny if criteria in 1177.05(a) are not met; this is an ER-2 district; do not believe this use is compatible with ER-2 district as evidenced by conditional uses spelled out in code; does not appear in any one of them; with regard to no undesirable effects on area, believe in terms of the code, this is primarily a business as opposed to a residence and code requires the reverse; business use must be incidental; believe this plan wouldn't be here if it was the other way around; slight concern regarding Section 1177.03(b)(10) that this complies with all federal and state laws; don't have homeowner before us as part of the application; on balance, feel the concept has viability but it belongs in a commercial area and I can't support.

Greenblott stated she agreed with Peck; can't support; also feel this is primarily a business; by own testimony there are activities conducted by people who are not residents of the home; Section 1177.03(b)(3) addresses the issue of family members; will not be able to support; however, do think this is a great idea and hope you can find a commercial spot in which to make this happen.

Canter stated she would concur; feel this is much needed; but it violates the spirit of the

home occupation; does not appear to be a subordinate use and other persons are necessary to run; hope you can get it off the ground elsewhere.

Mullin stated he would concur with comments offered.

Thom stated he would echo comments made; concept sounds great; new to you and new to us; but have to see this as a commercial business venture.

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

Yes	0	
No	5	Smith, Mullin, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

Chair stated that the applicant had the right to appeal this decision to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals within 20 days; contact the Clerk's office for further information.

PP-0003-2000

To consider a preliminary plat application for the construction of a 13 lot subdivision to be known as Woodmere Place; 3.9+/- acres on Old McCutcheon Road; Doug Maddy, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 6/29/00 and 7/06/00)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Glen Dugger, 37 West Broad Street, stated he was present representing the applicant; property is 3.9 acre tract on east side of Stygler Road; is 150' by 1200' deep lot with original house on it and a number of outbuildings; to the north is Marjoram Drive; to the east is McCorkle Park; to south is school property; McCutcheon Road used to run along the entire south boundary of this property; proposal is to take 3.9 acres and subdivide to 13 lots; meets SF-3 zoning standards; exceeds the size of the lots to the north; the existing home would remain on lot 2; working with engineering staff on needed upgrades to McCutcheon Road in that location; house price range is anticipated to be in the \$180,000 to \$240,000 range; is a fairly significant demand for new construction in this market place; square footage requirements would exceed code; City has requested a cul de sac and we have done that; glad to answer any questions; will be available for workshop to discuss further; think this is fairly simple and straight forward; plat complies with zoning; can't be much more than it really is; we would be glad to answer any questions now or at workshop.

Chair asked for opponents. Rebecca McCoy, 337 Marjoram, stated she had fields behind her home; Junior League Football is held at Middle School West along with many other activities; parking over there at diamond 5 is on McCutcheon and wondering what will happen when some of that is gone; we desperately need more parking over there not less; thought eventually this area might have been donated for a parking lot to help congestion; also the house has been empty for a long time; lots of critters running around; there's a chicken coop on the property among various other buildings; where will they run to; don't want critters in my yard; that's my concerns as a homeowner; where will they all go; will be bad; when activities are going on at West there is no place to park so they park up and down old McCutcheon; something has to be done; unless they move sports.

Mrs. Price, 263 Marjoram Drive, stated she was also behind this property; is a nice field; when we purchased our home they told us that if property was sold it would be sold to schools to make it better for parking at football games, etc; is a nice property; if you put

houses back there and a giant fence will destroy the look of the area.

Phyllis Barrett, 249 Marjoram, stated hers was the last house behind this development; next to my house is the open field; do have the problem with all critters; when and if they start how it will affect dust and so on; last house before the open field; also wondering about our road; will there be a connection to McCutcheon; will it continue to be a dead end.

Chair asked for rebuttal. Dugger stated that as to last question, have been told by engineering staff, and contained as part of the plat, the eastern most portion of the property would be a cul de sac only to service this 13 lots; don't know how to address critter problem; with regard to the parking which occurs there, to my knowledge parking is within the right of way and theoretically we aren't making it go away; actually will improve with widening of deteriorating McCutcheon Road; is a period of time in construction phase when the parking problem will be exacerbated; the availability of parking in public right of way is City's final determination whether parking is or is not allowed on street.

Mullin questioned the width of the right of way. Dugger stated he was not certain; a note on plat indicates from center line to our property line is 40'; that doesn't seem to scale right; between now and workshop will have that answer. Dugger continued that if there is a 40' right of way now, the total right of way by subdivision ordinance would appear to require 50' at least; cul de sac would have a 100' minimum diameter. Maddy stated that at request of Mayor the street was located off center of right of way to preserve trees on south side; from south boundary of lots believe it scales at 60'; will find out.

Smith stated for the record he is opposed to the turn around; would rather see it go through; where will people go; once we open up to McCorkle Park it gives people a place to park; is short sighted and foolish that we don't provide sufficient access to recreational fields; if we open up all the way to McCorkle people can park and walk up to fields to watch; no reason to cut off all the rest of us on the west side; leave my home and have less than 1.4 mile drive to get there; with this route would have to drive 1-1/2 miles just to get to McCorkle Park; that's ludicrous; what does that say to those of us who live on west side; what will happen is that people will still go down there and will end up going through someones yard and upset neighbors and critters; doesn't make sense to put a cul de sac. Dugger stated it was done at request of administration; understand it is a neighborhood sentiment; don't want to get caught in a war; tell us what you want and we'll do it.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:05 p.m.

Chair stated he would assign this item to workshop on July 19 at 6:15 p.m.

Dugger stated he will be here for workshop on the 19th but will be out of town on the 26th; hope to make progress so Maddy can represent himself that evening.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

V-0017-2000

To consider a variance application to vary Section 1145.06(a); Yard Requirements; to allow a front porch to extend over the front setback building line; for property located at 91 Crown Hill Court; Janet McCue, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 7/06/00)

Chair opened Public Hearing at 8:07 p.m.

Janet McCue, 91 Crown Hill Court, stated she needed to make repairs to the front porch;

builder is here if you have any questions; in getting ready to pull permits found this problem existed; front porch was there and am just asking for the variance to cross the setback line; is hard to tell because it is on the curve.

Peck stated the porch appears to have been added on after it was built but before McCue purchased; any idea of how long it has been there. Contractor stated it would appear to have been there 6 or 7 years.

In response to question, was stated that this issue came to light when contractor attempted to pull a building permit; that's where it was caught; grandfathered or not grandfathered. In response to question, D'Ambrosio stated they could find no record of a permit being pulled when porch was built or a variance being granted.

Peck asked how much of a variance is needed. Contractor stated it is about a foot; house is not on the setback line so a portion of the porch is behind the setback. In response to question from Mullin, contractor stated it is an open deck with railing; there is no roof.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:11 p.m.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Canter stated that as applicant has testified, the front porch was on when she bought it; has been on for 6 or 7 years and to deny and require this to be removed would be an undue hardship on the applicant; will support.

Peck noted we had recently turned down a similar case also in Royal Manor; are similar circumstances but some significant differences; property owner purchased this property with existing deck there as opposed to last applicant that we turned down where he wanted to extend a new porch into the area; feel that is a significant difference; also this is existing only 12" to 18" beyond front line; don't want to draw a line as to what is acceptable and what is not but view 4' request by previous applicant as significant and 18" here is not a significant deviation; will support.

Smith stated he had driven by this property; agree with Peck that 12" is not noticeable; is not out of character with neighborhood; distinction is that current property owner has inherited this problem; will support.

Thom stated he will support as he felt there is a hardship; will support.

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

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

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DR-0044-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovation; for property located at 110 N. Hamilton Road; McDonald's Restaurants, applicant.

Ray Riska, McDonalds, 2 Easton Oval, stated that as discussed in work session will make changes as we talked about; glad to answer questions you might have.

Turley asked for an explanation on what will be illuminated. Riska stated there is a difference in type of illumination; beam throws light down; is not illuminated inside; 2 fluorescent lights with a cap; new roof lights are 6" wide and one fluorescent bulb going

down that lets light through. Turley asked for a comparison of wattage of the two different lightings. Riska stated there was 1 bulb and it was translucent and other is 2 bulbs; same kind of bulb; will be about half the wattage.

Greenblott stated we had a situation where we had a Chinese restaurant that had neon around the window; when on it was very bright and they turned it down; can that be done with your light strips. Riska stated he did not believe you can turn down fluorescent; we're not talking neon, just fluorescent. Canter asked if they could purchase a lower wattage bulb. Thom stated you can't go that high on fluorescent. Smith stated the sites he had looked at in the evening were not that distracting; big toy sits in front of this. In response to question on PMS colors, was stated that it is the large corporate color scheme; same PMS numbers for every one; in dealing with an individual is more important to get those numbers; not necessarily required unless Development Department would want it. D'Ambrosio asked that they be submitted for the record.

Motion was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion; Turley stated she cannot support this application; although don't have a problem with changing colors, the gray slate like roof to red and internally illuminated light beams is not compatible with more subdued colors and architecture of the neighboring buildings; somebody in the past went to great lengths to develop that area in a subdued manner; red painted slate would be too much; just because it is typical nationwide, we don't have to accept it; with design review we have option to reject; won't support.

Greenblott stated she concurred; think you have to take a stand and can't go along with painted red roof and yellow light beams; won't support design review.

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

Abstain, COI	1	Mullin
Yes	4	Smith, Peck, Canter and Chairman Thom

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0045-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 367 Granville Street; Morningstar Chiropractic by Branham Sign Co., applicant.

Stephanie Morgenstern, 3022 Minerva Lake, stated she was one of the owners of the business; glad to answer any questions. Thomas E. Branham Jr., Branham Signs, stated he was here to propose a new double sided sign for this location.

Greenblott asked why the reader board. Branham stated business liked the idea of changeable copy for special messages; advertise different classes he will be having; specials he is running; just to advertise like some other businesses down there. Greenblott asked if they would lose the reader board. In response to question from Morgenstern, Greenblott stated she did not like the precedent it set; don't like the look; think it is an attractive sign without the changeable copy; my experience with change is that it detracts from the quality of signs; we have community newspapers in which Dr. Morgenstern can advertise classes or specials; think it would be by far a more attractive sign minus that. Turley stated she also has a concern with reader board and would like to see that portion withdrawn.

Smith suggested they correct the spelling of counseling; don't want you to put a sign up with spelling errors; could drive away clientele.

In response to question on reader board, Morgenstern stated there are 8 other signs that have reader boards from our property to Mill Street. Peck stated that many of the signs are older signs that were erected before the design review process; couple of them are non profit; new one was put in at church after some consternation; as you go along Granville Street this body has only approved a new reader board at the McDonalds Classic on the west side; that also met with some opposition but was in keeping with a 40's and 50's theme being proposed for that type of structure; in terms of new signs near your location, Boston Market did not get one; Dairy Queen is over 20 years old; car wash is prior to this process; Mifflin Church is only one approved by this body; must have known our concern or you wouldn't have counted reader boards.

In response to question on the separation of the sign panels, Morgenstern stated they preferred the look with the separation. Greenblott asked if applicant was familiar with landscaping requirements. Morgenstern stated that are working on plans for landscaping for the building as well as the sign.

In response to question, Branham stated the sign will be illuminated by spotlights; not sure of wattage but is very low; will get illumination information in for the record. In response to question from Greenblott on the building signage, Morgenstern stated that sign would come down. Greenblott thanked applicant for removing the building sign.

Discussed

A motion was made by Peck to approve DR-0045-2000 subject to the condition that the reader board be eliminated and to approve external uniform lighting of the sign surfaces.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

DR-0046-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage; Steak 'n Shake, Inc., applicant.

Steve Master, 1120 Rice Avenue, stated he was Real Estate Manager for Steak 'n Shake; stated developer gave them criteria for signage; adhered to that criteria but was not told there was a requirement for approval through this process; thought we only needed to follow developer's specifications; signage does match others in the center.

In response to question as to why there was no Steak 'n Shake in Gahanna, Masters stated he was working on it.

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

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

CC-0013-2000

To recommend to Council a change to Section 1167.18, Screening Requirements, of Chapter 1167, General Development Standards, to reference Landscaping Requirements found in Chapter 913.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop.

Discussed

CC-0014-2000

To recommend to Council the approval of changes to Section 1163.02, Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Required; and 1163.08, Interior Landscaping Requirements, of Chapter 1163, Parking Regulations

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop.

Discussed

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole

Thom made the following appointments: CIC - Thom; Creekside Development Team - Greenblott; Olde Gahanna Design Review - Turley.

C.I.C.

Thom stated the met last Monday and had quick overview of Creekside Development; as a group that morning endorsed the concept as we had seen it at that time; is not the final concept but endorsed by CIC; looking at establishing parking authority under CIC as well as Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Creekside Development Team

Greenblott stated they had met with Groves and were given a little syllabus; White will be presenting to us shortly.

Creekside Design Review Committee.

Turley stated they had met on June 29; started reviewing some model ordinances pertinent to what we will be doing.

Sign Committee: No report.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

Director of Development.

White stated that before you is the Gahanna Creekside Concept Plan that encompasses Big Walnut Creek on the west; conceptual plan that has schematic drawings; will utilize this for the subsequent concrete plan and implementation; in my goals and objectives for year 2000 noted we would be asking for adoption of a conceptual plan for revitalization of that area; step A was to send to Planning Commission and receive a recommendation; asking you to look at this executive summary; is based on a fairly straight forward plan for the initial phase; areas north of black line shown on plan is the initial phase; this would be the area developing; is a mixed use area; complementary uses and area needed to support; includes a parking structure; would still have first floor level, creek level for retail, and office use; would not be looked at solely as a parking structure but some of the other areas can integrate parking structures and hide them; as you go through and read this, critical points are proposing to extend canals 1,500 linear feet ; developable creekwalk area; 130,000 sf of usable retail or entertainment; 12' to 14' below current Mill Street level; restoration and conservation of Big Walnut Creek and interface with west bank of Big Walnut; end result is to have an adopted plan that we work from; several plans that have been proposed and ended up on the shelf; would like to have a plan we use as a working document; you will be receiving and approving specifics as we move forward; future phase would deal with southern end; cost estimates are included; call if you have questions; these are estimates; is a \$20 million project with land acquisition and improvements; market data that supports it; ask Planning Commission for your regular approval process; discuss and review and look at; make whatever comments and concerns you have with your recommendation.

Peck asked if there is envisioned as part of the approval process overall the opportunity for public hearings; after our review or before. White stated it can be done any way you like; can have a public hearing if you wish; allows public the opportunity to address; it

does go to Council; will be opportunity for public input at Council. Peck stated he did not want to plow the same ground twice; where would it be more effective.

Thom stated that for all conceptual plans we have had public hearings; always felt we should have them at our level. White stated she felt comfortable with doing that; can have consultant here if you wish; is a conceptual plan; is not the final concrete plan; whatever public comment is we have to take into consideration. IN response to question, White stated the plan was not displayed in the front entry yet.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop next week; will hold public hearing at meeting on the 26th; requested Clerk advertise the public hearing.

Chair.

White introduced Jason Lockhart, one of the new interns in Development. Thom noted he would be out of town and not in attendance at workshop next week.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS: None.

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Smith congratulated Sherwood on her promotion.

Turley stated that Captiva Island, Florida, is a perfect example of tourist town with strict but not boring sign control that can create a community; sign change is limited to 18" by 18"; is an area with slower traffic; most signs are approximately 10 sf; are all wood and externally illuminated; such a good example of what signage control can do.

Peck stated he wished comment on Hogan's visit at last meeting; was gracious enough to share his views on Creekside; clarify for record that although I am an attorney, I am not this Board's attorney, this City's attorney, or an attorney for the residents of my area; is not my role to champion the cause of any group other than my own activities; citizens that have concerns or questions go to Weber or King who advises this board as to legalities of its actions; those are not questions for me.

L. ADJOURNMENT: 9:00 p.m.

MOTION by Greenblott, seconded by Peck, to adjourn.

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC/AAE
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by Planning Commission on July 26, 2000.

DAVID B. THOM, Chair

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

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

Chair Signature