

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 26, 2000

Commission Members will meet in Committee of the Whole at 6:00 p.m.

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 26, 2000. The agenda for this meeting was published on July 21, 2000. Chair David B. Thom called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission Member Canter.

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 Turley, to approve the minutes of the July 12, 2000 meeting. ROLL CALL: Voting yes: Smith, Turley, Mullin, Peck, Canter, Greenblott, Thom. 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.

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 7:06 p.m.

Jackson B. Reynolds, Smith & Hale, 37 West Broad Street, stated he was present representing the applicant; preliminary plat is for 3.9 acres containing 13 lots; zoned SF-3; meets all of the setback requirements for rear yards, side yards, and front yards; proposing to maintain Old McCutcheon Road in an upgraded and repaved manner; simply here for direction tonight as to what else should take place; application before you is a preliminary plat.

Chair stated that preliminary plats are approved or denied here; changes made to final plat and then are recommended to Council; can deny or recommend for final approval; final approval of the final plat will be at Council level.

In response to question from Smith, Reynolds stated the road would be widened to city standards of 26' and will have mountable curbs; Maddy has committed to the mountable curbs.

Sherie James-Arnold, 167 Gothic Court, stated she was the Council representative for Ward 2 which this property is part of; don't see me here very often; you do your job and I do mine; at Council is when I would normally address but this doesn't come to Council; since Mayor's letter went out to residents of Imperial Rise felt I needed to attend; as a resident my involvement became at a higher level; not really against or for; know how well Brookewood does their developments; looking tonight at 13 lots; are a lot of different things going on; one that happened about 2 years ago was that the City purchased McCorkle tract for football fields; parks indicated to us they needed the land and we bought it specifically for football and our involvement stopped at that time;

ingress and egress were not an issue at that time; need for little league parks is great; we have no idea of what will happen on Woodmere Place; whether old McCutcheon is stubbed or a cul de sac has become the main issue; understand your job is the parcel in front of you but you need to look at the big picture; can't imagine they won't have to deal with traffic in a large way; just think back to the 4th of July; for people on Armor Hill it has been nice to live on a stub street for 28 years; ask you this evening to work on the preliminary plat and show a stub; old McCutcheon is a road; whether it became designated for nature walks and we put dirt on it or not, City ordinances state that this is a road; it has never been vacated; Franklin County also says it is a road; was no Woodside Green when I moved here 24 years ago; have seen a lot of growth; when we moved to Imperial Rise 4 we were only the 2nd house there; enjoyed field where my house now is; suggest you show this as a stub street and go ahead with what you need to do so Council can discuss what they want to do with Ridenour Road ; noise and ingress and egress for football fields are the issue not the preliminary plat; looking at the 13 lots; residents can bring to Council their concerns; do have a large concern for the health, safety and welfare of our residents; emergency equipment will be limited to one street; how are we going to get people in and out on 4th of July; good planning dictates we look at the bigger picture; 13 lots will not change the whole complexion of the city; are looking at whether old McCutcheon should be opened or whether Council will vacate; ultimately it is our vote; was discussed in committee on Monday evening; 1 person suggested vacating; other was not so sure; are 7 votes and only speaking for myself; my backyard is Ridenour Road; my son went to Chapelfield and Middle School West; are used to construction; if your concern is about the football fields bring it to Council; if concern is about the road Council is the only one that can vacate; is a Council decision to do that.

Canter asked if Council had any discussion about access when they appropriated the money to buy the land; puts this body in a difficult decision; access to the park is not part of the plat; was there consideration to access when you arranged to purchase. James-Arnold stated they were waiting on layout; ingress and egress with a curb cut on Ridenour or small section of old McCutcheon and let them come in that way; when property was purchased, Old Ridenour was not a designated bike path either; while Parks and Recreation suggested we purchase was not really discussed; cars are tolerated on Ridenour; not sure how they meant to get in; knew the road was not vacated and could be opened; all three were considered; thought the various options would be considered when they came forward with the final plan.

Chair asked for opponents. Eric Ochs, 393 Armor Hill, stated his house is one that is directly affected; wanted to share concern on ingress and egress and capability of Armor Hill and Old Ridenour; have 4 children and been there 2 years; wife babysits; there are a lot of children in the neighborhood; think that a lot of thought and discussion should be put forth to change the neighborhood significantly; decision to completely open old McCutcheon is a major change; real concern is capability of our neighborhood to sustain such a large volume of traffic; is not the case today; appreciate your time.

Eric Ressler, 388 Armor Hill Drive, stated this area has always been known as a peaceful place but also a great place to live; remember when I was a kid liked listening to wildlife that was back there like birds, insects, etc; that's what has added to the neighborhood; putting in any houses is wrong; will disrupt our traffic; feel it puts my neighbors in jeopardy; road is not able to carry that many cars; there is no excuse for putting houses in; park would be better; for the park but against the houses; we don't need them; remember where we used to have a field over there for playing in; don't want that tarnished; want to show my kids where I lived and it was a good place; for the park but against the houses 100%.

Pam Ochs, 393 Armor Hill, stated she lived in the third house from the dead end; have this big open field of the schools behind us with baseball diamonds where they want to put a street through; already deal with volume of people in the area; tons of people on our streets for baseball; all activities are in the field; can tolerate that; am fine with that; but putting a huge football field and houses along with opening up Armor Hill to all of the traffic means we will become the major road; we will endure the emergency equipment and everything else; will be a huge volume of traffic; the fact that we have had it closed is a plus; understand development and that we have to move ahead; understand that any open space in Gahanna will be prey for vultures; but you have to think about the volume of traffic you will dump onto our one street; are a lot of children on our street; children that aren't used to that kind of traffic; is it really what will be safe for the community; fire trucks, emergency squads, baseball fields and now football fields and 4th of July activities; this is a bad idea.

Mary Ellen Ballenger, 409 Armor Hill, stated she was pretty disgusted with what she received in the mail; just purchased this home 6 weeks ago; is the very last house on Armor Hill; have an empty lot next to us; one reason we bought is because it was the last house on a dead end street; piece of paradise we will no longer have; walk our dog in that park; see rabbits every single day; 4th of July in our front yard; don't know what will happen; picked a dead end street so we could be without fear of a car going down the street and being hit; every reason we purchased the home for is being wiped away; don't know who the developers are; just have a letter saying this is no longer going to be; pretty disgusted; they already park on the dead end street for softball; go park in appropriate places is what we tell them; people will park on our dead end street; what do we do; look for a new house; that was the reason we bought here.

Ken Cover, 373 Armor Hill, stated his home was by the walkway into the fields at Chapelfield; when you look at plat for Imperial Rise 3 it was built to be a connector street originally; is less than 26' wide; when you go down Chapelfield it narrows from 32' to 26' at Moorfield; that traffic is jammed all day long with school, football, and baseball; have lived there for 23 years; wanted our children to be able to walk to school; we enjoy the kids and tolerate those problems that come along with it; need to look at the overall plan; with a 26' street you will have a mess; even if you look at Old McCutcheon down to Ridenour; can't park on that street and have 2 way traffic; can not do it; don't want to not be able to park in front of my home; we are actually under 26' and that's curb to curb; measured it at 25'8"; know Armor Hill was built as a connector but is not wide enough to be a connector street; don't know why they let him build it to be a connector; all the streets narrow down; on July 4th traffic was 1-1/2 hours on Highbury and Armor Hill trying to get out; we'd be looking at that kind of traffic every day; need to look at how to get in and out of that park with wider roads than you have now; that will be the problem.

Brian Ressler, 388 Armor Hill, stated he has lived there since 1977; was brand new house when we moved in; liked the street because it dead ended; kids that grew up there had a good place to play and it's where our teenagers cars parked; won't be all parked in driveway and garage; don't take street parking away from families; is a lot of wildlife in the area; see rabbits and raccoons and deer; like to see how many people from neighborhood are here and how they feel as a whole; did get letter from Mayor; appears that map enclosed takes old McCutcheon down towards Armor Hill as a cul de sac with no access; old McCutcheon would be a dead end; would have 9 or 10 new houses to the east of Armor Hill; don't have a problem with 9 or 10 houses flowing out to Armor Hill but do have a problem with 800 cars for football traffic if the rest of old McCutcheon is opened up.

Ken Brantley, 381 Highbury Crescent, stated he was the corner house that dumps onto Armor Hill; when football facility was being planned there was consideration given; know that Parks Department is trying to change around a little bit how they are arranged; talked about not letting concessions centralize; plan shows 6 trees along a drive that opens up into a parking lot; don't have a problem with old McCutcheon being more developed up to the entrance of the football facility with multiple trees on a permanent drive; don't have a problem with Armor Hill being extended down to Lion's Path to open up for C V Perry's 3 lots and allow him to donate that additional land in the back; first of all if every parent drove separately and left at the same time you would have 800 cars; but realistically looking at 400 cars; is way too much to put out on Armor Hill; McCutcheon could be increased to where you have a middle turn lane and 2 lanes to handle traffic both ways in order to service that area; realistically also probably need to put a light out to Stygler; how many near misses will their need to be; maybe move the light from Middle School West down to old McCutcheon; that would make sense for traffic flow; don't think Armor Hill is the best solution; need to put a 3rd lane on old McCutcheon down to the facility; let enough parking be done so we can enjoy the parks; can't park to see your kids play; only half opposed to the solution; half for it; open up McCutcheon by school property and keep Armor Hill dead ended so C V Perry can utilize those few lots; incorporate others into Lion's Path so it's used for what the kids have created it for.

Norma Burke, 380 Canford Place, asked if consideration has been given to extra traffic on Chapelfield; many children walk Armor Hill to and from school; what effect will this have on property values on Armor Hill when they can't park in front of their homes; what kind of noise will be created by football games; will need extra traffic lights; who has final decision on whether to open this up for through traffic.

Doug Zastrow, 394 Canford Place, stated were hearing a lot of discussion but don't seem to be headed in a direction; 2 years ago the park land was purchased; since then bike path has been added; can go two directions here; to get 800 cars to a park you can divert some down Ridenour Road which states that autos will be tolerated and discourages traffic; on the other hand there has been a study to show we need these three fields; in the 2 years since this was purchased, this area has changed; is talk about preventing parking from Armor Hill; more traffic on Olde Ridenour doesn't make sense; 13 lots won't change the complexity but have a concern with parks; looking at 2 different directions with one plan; opposed to opening up old McCutcheon as it will become a cut through; will be a through street; C V Perry has said they will donate; that's not in writing so we have no assurances of that; if old McCutcheon opened what will prevent him from building; that's a concern to me; been there since 1986 because it is quiet; applaud you for river front development; looking at diffusing a bunch of cars for 3 ball fields and that doesn't make sense; a lot of changes have taken place since this land was purchased.

Mike Green, 346 Highbury Crescent, stated his was a connector between Armor Hill and Chapelfield; currently there is no traffic on it; understand your dilemma; feel sorry for you members; understand that we do need to develop; Stygler is already choked with traffic; saw the street was stubbed and assumed it would be opened up eventually; knew the possibility; Armor Hill is not directly tied to these 13 lots; seems to be a foregone conclusion that McCutcheon would be left and would open up Armor Hill; think one will lead to another; won't beat traffic issues to death; Highbury will be a natural shortcut; feel this is premature to think about now and possibly need to table; Council needs to decide what they want to do and if they need park; maybe buy and use for parking lots; if they decide to vacate the road it is a moot issue; other things need to be thought about;

not sure it is the right time to make a decision on this; if you just go ahead the rest of the dominos will follow; 800 cars in our neighborhood is unacceptable; suggest you postpone and let Council do their job.

With no opposition from Commission Members, Chair extended the time for the public hearing.

John Hastings, 409 Armor Hill, stated he had just moved in; haven't had a chance to research this issue; first weekend I spent at home and we got this letter; whoever thought this land was suitable for an active park was pretty dumb in the first place; suggest you keep as a metropolitan park with proper parking; if a few houses will be developed that makes sense; would rather not see it for selfish reasons; can visualize a clean metropolitan type park with extension of the bike trail; my thoughts are moving in why pick on this area; no idea of lots across from school; driving by there seems to be plenty of room there for football fields; don't see any plans for parking; don't see any explanation of how traffic will be done but haven't researched; if you paved old McCutcheon and take down to cul de sac the houses on Armor Hill wouldn't be affected; agree with most of the people who oppose the football fields on traffic and safety for the kids.

Donna Lindsay, 498 Coriander, stated some of the questions were brought up last week; people use old McCutcheon right now for parking during football games; talked about the possibility of having a rolled curb so that could continue; that would take some of the people off Armor Hill on to old McCutcheon; live in Sherwood Meadows close to the park; have spoken to Mitchell on how they were planning to get people in to the park; he always told me old McCutcheon; felt it was big enough that it would be the entry way.

Joyce Snelbaker, 231 Chapelfield Road, stated we have been talking about bringing all this traffic in with 800 cars plus; we don't know what's going on with Creekside; Chapelfield is already a cut through; hitting us from Creekside and Easton and now adding football fields; are a lot of little kids and new families; don't think it is a good idea.

Teresa Oddi, 1062 Creswell Drive, New Albany, stated she has a few vested reasons for being interested; my brother just purchased a home at 383 Canford Place; I am a real estate agent and have been selling for 13 years; had that property listed several years ago; loved having nothing behind him; made him aware that potential development could take place; with Central Ohio growing it will happen in the future; he knew that and was still irate when he got the letter; are 3 issues here; one stating should these 13 lots be developed; property is for sale; that's probably what will happen; can always use residential; know that Maddy builds wonderful homes; will they put in \$90,000 houses; you can't build that type of home in this area; \$180,000 to \$220,000 as has been stated would be comparable to Sherwood Meadows; homeowners there should have no concerns; thing the cart is before the horse with McCorkle Park; knowing how traffic goes through they do use Chapelfield; is a very residential street and it is still used very much; issue here is should these ballfields be opposed - absolutely; if they did not describe where access would be it was not thought through; you could open up McCutcheon; you have a soccer field existing on east side of Old Ridenour; if it's going to occur why not use all three measures but not Armor Hill; am not hearing anybody say they don't want development; C V Perry kept this finger; only access for 10 potential homes; should a park be built and should these lots be developed; live in Harrison Pond and there are soccer fields; tried to count recently on Challis Springs; are 180 parking spaces by those fields; they cut through Harrison Pond Drive and go directly to Challis

Springs and Clark State; development part is what we have to concentrate on and park issue is separate; we are talking about 13 new lots; by reading letter interpreted as to open old McCutcheon was going to happen and that's the only way in and out; have a 2 year old son and wouldn't want that in my neighborhood; just coming out Armor Hill or out on just Stygler wouldn't seem acceptable either; feel you need to use every measure and open up all access or it is just not feasible.

Thom stated that a letter of opposition for the opening of old McCutcheon or Armor Hill had been received from Bob Kelley, 396 Antcliff Court.

Tom Komlanc, Assistant City Engineer, stated that he did not know where figure of 800 vehicles came from; residential properties would generate about 33 or 35 trips; 5 football fields and youth league games would add quite a bit; by adding fields you would have 20 kids per team with 2 teams playing on each of the 5 fields plus cheerleaders and officials; looking from 250 to 350 vehicles in there; based on 1 car per person; could have mom and dad separately; 800 needs to be looked at closer; cut through traffic would be added to that; will work on for workshop.

Chair asked for rebuttal. Reynolds stated they were stuck in the middle; piece of property of 3.9 acres is currently zoned SF-3 and allows development of 13 lots; dedicated right of way is there; developer has agreed to pave it to serve our houses; are larger issues out there; seeking your guidance and the City Administration's on how to handle what we do in the future; listening as well; larger issue with this; listen to your all counsel.

Greenblott asked if client was aware of letter dated 7/21 from Mitchell that recommends that we might take park land instead of fees even with extensive land already there; thinking is based on additional land being needed to improve entrance to McCorkle Park. Doug Maddy, 120 N. High Street, stated he did not see letter; attended Parks and Recreation Board meeting 2 weeks ago; that commission would rather have fees in lieu of park land. Greenblott stated that was our understanding; this came in our packet and was surprised to see it; can't help but think this would have some impact on your layout. Reynolds stated he had not seen the letter; is a lot of green space there already; would like to look at letter. Peck stated it was addressed to Planning Commission from Director with copies to Council; no indication that it was sent or intended to be sent to applicant.

In response to question from Smith, Maddy stated it would be somewhat devastating to eliminate lot 13 from the plan; looking at access issue; there is an existing 50' right of way to the park; don't know that the access would be much improved; we would prefer to pay fees instead of giving land; 50' wide right of way going into a dead end that is a park; the need to come up with additional land to put access way in doesn't make much sense to us.

Canter stated she would like to address a couple of statements in Mayor's letter; the 4th paragraph states that Planning Commission proposed an alternate plan; Planning Commission proposed nothing; we discussed it in workshop last week; statement that "they intend to open" never occurred; to the people who received this letter, none of this was stated; am resentful that these statements were made to you; we talked and talked for hours; this body is hear every Wednesday night; we turn down a lot of proposed plans; turned down a recent one of this developers because we felt it was overdeveloped; we are dealing with this proposed development; residents need to address park issue to Raleigh Mitchell; we did not request the park; we have nothing to do with the park; do need to take access into account; we did not design or build this park site; that's under

the purview of the Parks and Recreation Board; need to address your concerns on the park to them; playing over there will be gone; will be parking lots and stands and football fields; look at the plan; this has nothing to do with this body; we want to get back to talking about the development before us; is it providing adequate access and ingress to protect your neighborhoods; many options are available; only certain things are allowed by law; old McCutcheon has not been vacated; will not vote tonight; appreciate everyone coming out tonight; for concerns about park talk to Mitchell. we can't control park at all.

Thom stated we have a lot of unanswered questions this evening; will take to workshop for further study; proposed application is of 13 lots for 13 homes; old McCutcheon is a dedicated road from Stygler to Olde Ridenour; several proposals have been presented - to stub, to leave Armor Hill closed, to run it through, any combination you can think of was brought up; this commission does not have the authority to open, close, or vacate right of way or public road systems; we recommend to City Council who would then make that final determination whether a street is opened or closed; we don't have that right; we have a lot of questions like C V Perry's proposal; park land that we are looking at is for the subdivision of 13 lots in front of us this evening; it is part of this commission's duty to look at the entire area to see what effect it will have; if we didn't we wouldn't be doing our jobs; heard their are proposals by C V Perry but we have seen nothing in writing; you have heard as much as we have; 5 lots are proposed to be donated to City and 5 lots built; once again we have a lot of questions that are totally unanswered; try to arrive at a decision at the preliminary plat stage that everyone might be comfortable with.

Smith stated that the plat before us is for 13 lots on old McCutcheon; C V Perry's mystery designation to the administration doesn't impact these 13 lots; may take them into account but it is not before us; that muddies the water which is exactly what the Mayor did; case before us is preliminary plat period.

Greenblott stated she would ask however that at workshop Mitchell be asked to be present; not to debate whether football fields are needed but would like to have his ideas on the ingress and egress from this park and what their plans are for this park; in so far as it will impact the 13 lots Maddy brings before us.

Peck stated that the issue technically before us is the 13 lots on old McCutcheon; haven't heard a lot of opposition with 13 houses; we are not developers; we are not proponents or opponents; we have been selected and appointed to serve to represent your interests; problem we have is the same as yours; we have been given a plan that didn't make sense; 13 houses here with a cul de sac; because we have to put access to the park the issue becomes muddy; there is 25' to driveway on the end of the cul de sac; then it starts to snowball and that's where the picture you have comes in; administration has never proposed how to provide access; approved purchase of park; would rather see a park there than what is currently platted; feel it is better use of the land but providing access to the land becomes an issue; and that is not before us; is Council's decision; must come up with a proposal in a way that is equitable to everyone; my property rights do not increase with the length of time we own a home; whether you have lived here for 20 years or 6 weeks; we have equal property rights; our decision has to be based not on what is best for Armor Hill but for entire community; glad to see this many people here; wish we had more; core is how to get access to the park and who bears burden; does Armor Hill bear burden; does it go to Ridenour; all good questions but not questions we can answer; we'll do the best we can to take everyone's comments to bear because we are all neighbors and have been affected; I am very directly affected by Creekside as my street is gone; 3rd telephone pole this week has come down; Canter was affected when

Taylor Road went in; all of us sitting here have been affected to varying degrees; encourage you to stay involved with this process; make your concerns known to the appropriate people - to Parks & Recreation Board, Director of Parks, City Council and Mayor; we will do our best to assess any plan formally before us.

Mullin stated that serving on a Commission makes us responsible for making a decision; gladly accept responsibility for that decision; this commission had no part in McCorkle Park; as Peck so eloquently outlined the steps of discovery to find out what is happening is convoluted at best; major concern is letter; feel I should apologize for your letter; information you got was extremely incomplete and in my view, one sided, serving a single purpose; what was forgotten to be included was that some 2 years ago McCorkle Park was designated by the administration as the home of Junior League Football operation; has been in development since land was purchased; where the 800 car count came from we don't know; letter also failed to mention the fact that administration wants to send all of the cars, regardless of new improved McCutcheon, onto a street that will be 26' wide; it is no wider than any of the residential area streets within the area; as to the McCutcheon road discussion, right now C V Perry could come out without further approvals, except building permits, to build lots that are platted, and have been, since 1972; think there was a lot of misinformation presented in the letter; is unfortunate and feel you deserve to know what is going on; you need the entire array of information that is available; you as well as we so we can make informed and sound judgments; further think that the letter you received was very emotionally oriented based on one family's tragedy and not appropriate; was aimed to the emotional side rather than rational thinking; as to the park area, yes it is a traffic generator; number of vehicles in and out seems to be a guess; don't think it will be the 800 cited; development can take place within the area; Planning Commission has formally before it a preliminary plat for Woodmere Place which constitutes 13 residences on the north side of McCutcheon Road and west of Imperial Rise 3.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:20 p.m.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop on August 2 at 7:15 p.m. with public hearing to be reopened on August 9 at 7:00 p.m. similar to this evening; thank those of you here for your comments.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

CU-0010-2000

To consider a conditional use application to allow a Collision Claims Center; for property located at 191 Granville Street, OG-3 Zoning District; 3-C Collision Claims Center, by Dennis D. Pappas, applicant. (Public Hearing) (Remanded back to Planning Commission on September 21, 2000)

With no opposition from Commission members, Chair declared a recessed at 8:21 p.m. with all members returning to the dais when the meeting reconvened at 8:31 p.m.

Chair opened public hearing at 8:32 p.m.

Dennis Pappas, Chief Operating Officer, 3-C Body Shops, thanked Commission for opportunity to address; application is to allow a 3-C Body Collision Claims Center in the old 5th Third Bank building; presenting to you some changes; here to answer any questions and for you to let me know what we need to do; is a good opportunity for you as to redevelopment and for our company; very excited for opportunity to come in; we have a number of different locations; we are the largest collision and repair center in State of Ohio and 7th in nation in size; pioneered the idea of a satellite center; people contact us and if they have a driveable car it can be driven in to the satellite center; most traffic will be harder hit and we pick those up at accident site or their homes; as I wrote answers to questions on forms, was trying to get through that there will not be a lot of

wrecked cars in Gahanna's downtown area; may be 2 or 3 in a day that are never there for more than a few hours; ask that you take a look at some of our other satellite centers; are very well kept and we do a first class job of making a presence; have photographs and drawings; glad to answer any questions; sign company is here to address any graphics concerns.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Canter stated there was a lot of discussion in staff comments with concerns about the undriveable cars left after day would be complete; any way we could be made sure that it would not happen; we would like to have no cars left on site; is that a reality. Pappas stated it was a reality; own our own towing company with own flatbed trucks; have 3 new ones; any damaged automobiles are not left on lot overnight; in our Grandview location they wrote into the Planning Commission minutes that there would not be; guaranteed that. Canter stated she would request that would be a condition of approval. In response to question, Pappas stated they did want that facility; will spend a considerable amount of money on landscaping to dress it up and take better care of it; pride ourselves in our locations; keep it very attractive; will be flatbed trucks that come in 2 or 3 times a day; a large number aren't left there are at all; only there when they are driveable; our intent is when we go into facilities like this bank building that the drive in, usually in the back as at this site, is a sheltered area and that's where they cars will be put; taken to the back and that's where our trucks will pick them up; won't see damaged vehicles in lot; will see an employee's car; if you want to add that in to the proposal, we have no problem. Canter stated that letter saying no vehicles for more than x number of hours and none left overnight satisfied. In response to question from Canter, Pappas stated that hours right now are 8:00 am to 6:00 p.m. daily and from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 on Saturday; currently studying to extend Saturday to 3:00 p.m. but nothing definite now. Canter questioned traffic flow; looking at 10 cars a day or 100 a day. Pappas stated they get a lot of business from this area; that's why looking for a satellite center; expect this center to be one of our busiest and is a growing area; rapidly expect it to be one of our best and one of our best looking; would say that 10 cars a day would be a long shot; even then they will be moved within hours by our own fleet of trucks; we are not dependent on a towing company; would say that 10 is the maximum; may be some days where we would get 10 but do see that as the high point.

Thom stated he assumes that most of these cars will be driven in by the owner or will they be in such condition that they would be towed to the site. Pappas stated they never claimed that this would be a tow center; if another tow company picks up at accident site it would be taken to our Briggs Road corporate facility; cars here will be kept in rear of building.

Greenblott asked if the flatbed trucks carry one at a time. Pappas stated that the flatbed is a smaller model and can put 1 on flat and a stinger on the back where they can tow another one; unless 4 wheel drive which must go on flatbed; may have to make 2 trips.

Peck questioned the operation of the truck traffic at the Brice Road location; are cars there being picked up and taken to Briggs Road; do they come back from Briggs Road for customers to pickup. Pappas stated that the Brice Road location is a totally different design; simply an office where they do estimates, write them up, punch in computer and come up with estimates; we do the estimates first as basic estimates; comprehensive is done at corporate and then submit to insurance company; a satellite claims center is customer convenience; can arrange to have your car taken care of; at Brice Road most of the cars go to Lancaster center where we repair in Lancaster; do that because of logistics; Ricart Automotive is also done there; in process where they go through

Reynoldsburg and Ricart shipped over to Lancaster; they don't normally go to corporate; when we ship to Lancaster bring them to Brice Road; this facility will be similar to Grandview and Westerville; would be by special request only they would pick up here; normally drop off here and pick up at corporate facility for a number of reasons; if there is a problem when picked up we don't have technicians that can work on cars at satellite centers and we don't want to do that; we try to get the customers to pick up car at corporate center; will deliver back here if customer makes a specific request; don't charge them to tow car in but will charge them to tow back; we will not put mileage on a car.

Turley questioned the 6' x 4' building sign; seems to be over the ATM sign but the proportions are different. Pappas stated the ATM will be covered; will build a false wall in front of it to cover it; red won't be visible; will be a black background.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 8:47 p.m.

MOTION was made at this point in the meeting.

Discussion: Peck stated he went up to Westerville location; is a remodeled bank branch similar to this; was there on Saturday afternoon and again on Sunday and was not obtrusive; from that standpoint did not have a problem; could see a place for it in Gahanna; was involved as a citizen last year in something that resulted in a rewrite to our Olde Gahanna code and this falls within that district; has been much effort from Sycamore Run to Big Walnut Creek but your use is a little different; only real automotive use is for a parking facility and yet this isn't automotive but more of a traditional office; is more of a mix; can distinguish the difference; this is in a more commercial and open area as opposed to historic part of downtown; out of historic area in Westerville and set on Schrock Road; in Grandview the former bank is fairly removed from what it considers its core downtown but is on a busy street not unlike this location; with rewriting of code for downtown, on balance, don't believe I can support this use for this location; believe it would be a good addition to our community but encourage you to look elsewhere in the City; don't believe can support.

Canter stated she could support Peck's position; is a tremendous opportunity here but not in this location; working more tonight to further refine and develop at a standard that would preclude this; feel there are other venues that you could have; understand there is a great need; just in the wrong area; refer to Section 1169.03(c) Section 1, that this is not a conditional use with applicable development standards and not in accordance with appropriate plans for the area.

Greenblott agreed state she can't support based on same codes; referenced Section 1169.03(c)(1) and (4).

Thom sated he also agreed with others; have grave concerns with this type of business and future precedent.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

A motion was made by Peck, seconded by Canter, to approve CU-0010-2000 conditioned upon there being no overnight storage or on site repair of vehicles.. The motion failed by the following vote:

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

Granville Street; 3-C Collision Claims Center, Applicant. (Remanded back by BZA on September 21, 2000)

Thom stated there seemed to be no concern with sign; seems fine but no point to approve a sign after denying the use; just can't approve a sign if we don't approve the business.

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

FDP-0012-2000

To consider a Final Development Plan to allow construction of an office/warehouse facility; for property located at 790 Cross Pointe Road; Delta Consulting by Rich Ireland, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 7/20/00)

Chair opened public hearing at 8:55 p.m.

Todd Rieser, 2427 Swansea, stated he was with Dublin Building Systems; here for consideration of Final Development Plan for an 87,000 s.f. office manufacturing warehouse facility at Crossroads Commerce Center; address would be 790 Cross Pointe Road; meets all zoning requirements, site lighting and landscape requirements; did receive comments from staff regarding additional landscaping on south and west elevations; will provide that; general finish on building is architectural wall panels with stucco; limited glass and glazing; south wall is designed for expansion of 43,000 s.f. at which time the south wall then would be a stucco wall panel rather than metal wall shown currently; appreciate the opportunity to come before you and glad to answer any questions.

Chair asked for opponents. There were none.

Turley questioned plan showing location in relationship to entire development; requested that master plan be brought to workshop for reference. Greenblott asked that building samples be brought to workshop as well. Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop on August 2 at 6:15 p.m.

Heard by Planning Commission in Public Hearing

DR-0049-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; to allow construction of an office/warehouse for property located at 790 Cross Pointe Road; Delta Consulting, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

Discussed

S-0002-2000

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

Chair opened Public hearing at 9:00 p.m.

Sadicka White, Director of Development, stated at this time she wished to present the salient conceptual plan for the Creekside development along the banks of the Big Walnut Creek; area is bordered by Granville on the south; Carpenter on the north and Big Walnut on west; approximately 2 years ago we rezoned all of Olde Gahanna to clarify the area as one of the outcomes of prior plans for Creekside; it appeared at that time to

extend into some areas people thought were residential; looked at code and it did indicate those areas were not residential but in fact commercial in zoning; with the change of our code to cover Olde Gahanna we created this area but also we believe improved the zoning within the Olde Gahanna zoning district; protected areas like Carpenter and Shull where some of our older cottages and homes within that area are located; improved the existing mill race through Creekside with 1500' of developable Riverwalk; this Riverwalk or Creekside can be developed with approximately 120,000 s.f. of usable retail or entertainment; will be developed at a new level which is the canal level or below street; elevation of about 12 to 14 feet; traverse Creekside area by walkway and be protected by flood waters by a system of gates and floodwall; protection along the bank elevation would be needed to develop on the east of the creek; this plan proposes to continue the restoration of Big Walnut in its present condition; for implementation we need to adopt a conceptual plan; shows the development potential and direction we wish to pursue; we are asking for Planning Commission recommendation; this would say we would attempt to adhere to and accomplish a higher density in Creekside; is a mixed use area prime for redevelopment; is a combination of commercial, retail, and residential, as well as office; know that in order to effect this we have to create a partnership of public and private; first element is City Council and delineation of their functions; second is the consultant team of Urban Spaces and lead developer by process of proposals; would include Tricar and local architect George Parker; next is Community Improvement Corporation; and last is the Administration and Development Department; this partnership should utilize the private sector; public sector would provide the economic support; with this team effort the overall plan is accomplished; received today from MORPC that the statement of the 50 growth cities we are number 7; Hilliard is number 1; in that growth we have outgrown our center; in fact we have provided for development direction in all areas of our community except for the downtown area and west side which we are connecting in this overall area; is phased in 2 parts at this point; initial phase is from property north of the post office and goes up to Carpenter and also a parking structure on the east side of Mill Street that would support 120,000 s.f. of development for commercial and retail; does not include office or residential that could be there; to the end of a public private partnership we are working with EMH&T on their needs for office space and hope to incorporate that; in the public part of the plan we have to acquire as little land as possible; do know we have to make some acquisition and that is included in the plan; as to needs for acquisition, public parking again is conceptual; would be approximately 600 spaces to support new development; to make sure this occurs, we have a cadre of consultants, embellished by more consultants as we go forth for parking studies, traffic studies and so on; next Monday a traffic study will be proposed and presented to Council and Planning; will address some of these issues; second phase would be a future phase going from post office to Summerfields; looking at that direction; we own property occupied by post office; lease is through 2/29/2004; detailed lower level and retail area; created an extension of the canal to go across Mill Street and underneath parking garage; tentatively talked to some major property owners who are not objecting to this plan; not accepting but not objecting; been in touch with all property owners on Creekside and none of them object to the plan; told them that what would probably occur is further land acquisition should Council decide in that manner; extend the canal also and again creating the floodwall and working with Urban Spaces and Weiler Company; have a potential hotel developer for that site who wants an option; am looking at that; each and every development would come back to the Planning Commission; if the hotel would come to fruition it would have to come to you to go through the appropriate planning review as required by code; at this point in time will stop; this is not new to you and will allow for public comment; if there is a need to explain will reserve that time.

Thom questioned if the conference center portion is in initial phase. White stated it was

in the second phase; from there to the south; that would be the post office property. Thom asked if there was any thought or idea that post office may be out sooner. White stated a high level meeting with representatives had been held; are hoping to meet with post office officials from Washington and our representatives to discuss whether there could be an opportunity to relocate them within Gahanna and vacate that property prior to 2004. In response to question from Thom, White stated the hotel developer is asking for an option or first right of refusal for 6 month; will do a marketing and feasibility study in that time.

Greenblott asked if the conference center is part of the hotel. White stated they have asked for a second option; they would also like to have an option to put in the conference center; no action has been taken on that; are looking at Gahanna; being a suburb and they see a need for space for meetings or events from 50 to 300 people; conference center is not part of the hotel but they may look at it in the future; looking at the hotel as being the potential anchor for the first phase. Greenblott stated that in passing talked about parking structures and some were lots better than others; did you bring pictures. White stated she would have them for workshop.

Chair asked for opponents. Nick Hogan, 1040 Venetian Way, stated he was not sure he was exactly an opponent; purpose tonight is to deliver a message and ask for your help; even if you do not like the messenger please listen to message; what we have is terrific; have supported totally; loop trail study is fantastic and what is coming is good; it is Gahanna sized; been hearing a lot of concern that it cannot succeed - look at Easton and Stoneridge, waste of our tax dollars, City shouldn't act as a developer; project is a done deal so what good does it do to say anything, what about traffic; have fought to get this before you; this plan needs an independent review; vast majority of Council is ready to implement; Council was asked to approve based on the drawings only and Weber advised we have to have something in writing; administration is totally for; Urban Spaces is being paid about \$20,000 per month; how can we expect them to be impartial; the plan is called a concept plan; normally that means an idea of what may come; this could be your final plan; Council will implement but will Planning Commission review; will your role be to review just the pieces in a project under way; your role would be reduced to determining brick color and setbacks for individual pieces; what happened to the Parker plan had a lot of support; cost was much less than \$20 million; that plan was Gahanna sized; ask what needs to be asked; is it economically feasible; have letter form City of San Antonio; also have copies of my notes regarding Oklahoma City; both told me something important; that is that you don't build a Riverwalk to bring people; you have something to bring people first and then build the Riverwalk; the Riverwalk in San Antonio is not a planned development project; has taken since the 1930's and a lot of public support; it doesn't necessarily bring the people; the Alamo being one block away helps; 360 days of sunshine and a unique community also help; Riverwalk would never be a success on its own; proposal calls for you to purchase land; was told a week ago that San Antonio owns the property; they own one parcel plus a convention site; everything else is owned privately; other thing report says is it likely we will create 2,000 new jobs; is they are not created can the plan work financially; if we do where do we park them; of the 600 spaces recommended in the garage, 400 spaces are for hotel and EMH&T; most of the new 2000 jobs are retail, restaurant and specialty shops; these businesses demand customers by their nature; how many customers will it take to cover salary, overhead, and profit; at 5 customers per employee, that would be 10,000 customers visiting this small area; what do we do with traffic on a 2 lane road; could have a flea market crowd every day of the year; most important is the City, acting as a developer, going to be held to same standard as any private developer will be; you would ask a private developer for more details than the answers you are getting; don't think you would accept that on any other development; City needs to be held to same

standard and to the tune of \$20 million, probably held to a higher standard; this plan you have been asked to spend \$20 million on is about 6 pages; other plans you have recommended have been 67 pages and 87 pages; even the Moose Lodge on their recent rezoning for old funeral home to downgrade for their use was more pages than what you have; on the Creekside Loop Study which was information for a pedestrian walkway, you made some excellent recommendations to Council; we don't have the answer to a whole bunch of questions; don't see how you can recommend adoption without some of this; do what is best for Gahanna even if it upsets people now; as Thom said earlier one of your duties is to determine the impact on surrounding area; with this many customers what will we do; could Rt. 62 be widened to 5 lanes; widen Carpenter Road; already know from Hamilton Road that the county will not build a 3 lane road; expense would be totally ours; need to get these questions answered.

John McAllister, 620 Forestwood Drive, stated he caught wind of this; spend most of time earning a living; don't think anyone on Council is a real estate developer; what I see here in terms of this plan is a neat idea but would much rather see private capital and not money taken out of City coffers for what I consider to be a speculation; to me income tax is for street lights, trash hauling, police and fire; not grandiose plans that should be left up to private capital; there is a problem with City or State or Federal governments buying private land; it becomes public land and they become political lands; belongs to everybody therefore nobody; bureaucrats making decisions on our hard earned dollars and spending on property speculation; hope you take this under consideration; here to represent my pocket book as well.

John Dempsey, 1039 Greythorne Place, stated he did not know if he was an opponent or proponent; leaning both ways; own and operate Gahanna Automotive Supply; own 153 Mill Street; is one of the oldest businesses in Gahanna having been here since 1963; well established; the creation and design and restoration of mill race is wonderful and community will benefit from beauty for many years to come; as a business owner and property owner, we purchased as an investment and to curtail rental expenses; square footage is \$12 to \$15 per foot; in looking at conceptual plan seems to have been determined that \$20 per foot was established; what purchases were used to determine that price; appraisal done by Charles R Porter Co 6 months ago; read excerpt on valuation and analysis which seems to be a sales comparison approach; my property is on west side of Mill Street and it is all coming down my way; feel we are very similar to Best Courier and post office; neither one was used in my appraisal; they used Granville Street sales in 1996 and 1997; since inception of this redevelopment have been supportive and open with Development Department; have requested several relocation sites; received 3; one behind Strawberry Plaza which is vacant land; to build up to 7,000 s.f. would run between \$12 to \$15; doubles the current rent I'm paying myself; second is 2 acres at Stoneridge for \$495,000; that's \$200,000 above my appraisal and \$230,000 over what the \$20 a foot the conceptual plan recommended; this has no existing buildings; third was old Pizza Hut on Johnstown Road; that was \$200,000 for 1,800 s.f. which is 2,500 s.f. less than have currently; there really isn't a plan on relocating my business and don't see any plans for displacement of businesses; have a very affordable long term lease; rental expense is being controlled and part of my bottom line; NAPA has been there for 35 years; hard to put dollar figure on cost of relocation based on customer loss due to location; what is that worth; if relocated what about surviving another 35 years; just basics like shelving, computers, cost of moving, loss of business; will City help me advertise; don't know; lastly and more important is capital gains tax; if I don't purchase another commercial site will pay 1/3 in capital gains; leaves me about \$30,000 to relocate my business; is just not doable; this is a wonderful thing; am a life long resident; said in the past that we are more than willing to relocate our business; however, not to go into any new debt for another business; won't

allow anyone to make money off me; thank you for your time; would like to see a plan for business owners that are going to be displaced.

Patrick Dineen, 117 N. High Street, stated he was in phase 2 portion of the map; won't take a lot of time; grave concerns; been to many of the meetings when initial planning was tabled; surprised that this canal extension came along; felt this had fallen away; make it a personal point to be more involved in the future; don't have sense that private sector is pushing this; City development idea seems to be build it and they shall come; sense is they like the independent content; if decision is to go ahead, will it be by eminent domain; am not sure of the legal means that it takes place; is not always fair as last speaker alluded to; those are my main concerns; seem to have a piecemeal approach; what Phase 2 has in mind; sense of done deal; don't have a voice; will become more involved; will find out what facts I need.

Patricia Peck, 122 Oklahoma, stated she wished to speak to many parts of the plan; start by saying that book itself is very hard to follow; read from beginning to end; parts are extremely vague; some are not apropos to plan like the second half Columbus real estate market conditions; speaking of the second half of the booklet; in reading that in itself it is out of date; latest data is first three months of 1997; many statistics are quoted prior to that and finished in 1996; specific example is ground will be broken this summer for Sycamore Woods condominiums; these are not 2000 statistics; address several points; what do residents want; attended many of the meetings; developers were very much in favor; City officials and residents had different concerns; some of the concerns were that Creekside be for the people of Gahanna; heard that more than anything else; don't want something involved; want something for Gahanna to enjoy; have a great deal of support for parades and activities going on at Creekside; have enjoyed all of them; plan represented at those meetings was taken away; this is a new plan; contains many aspects that residents did not like the creek going under Mill Street, garage and hotel; most people wanted it to stop at Mill Street; this is not restoration of the natural flow of the creek; this is building on to it; suggest possibility that Gahanna DECA class, who does surveys every year, survey the residents of Gahanna to see what they would like to see rather than storekeepers and developers; density is next question; Olde Gahanna has been put to a variety of uses; fact that something is allowed doesn't make it the best use; new building at Walnut and High is huge and much larger than house that was there; takes up every bit of space of that lot; looking at a 600 car garage from Walnut to Carpenter and Mill to High; that's very dense in my opinion; walls for a parking garage don't seem aesthetically pleasing; Hogan spoke about the size of High Street; everyone has to go in and out somewhere; where will they drive; do we need Olde Gahanna to be a parking garage; this is the first according to White; others will be needed; at same time 2,000 new employees have to park somewhere and parking garage will be paid for by people paying to park; who will pay in Gahanna; don't know; think a lot of residents would not think it was necessary; do we need a hotel several stories high; will change look of downtown Olde Gahanna; do we want to do that; with 2,000 employees in hotel and other buildings an issue not brought up and addressed in plan is what will be done about refuse, sewers, waste and so on; it has to be addressed also; bringing in large numbers of people and buildings and putting them on our water side; what effect will have it on the rest of Olde Gahanna; we will have parking garages and huge buildings instead of a neighborhood; do we actually need this; do we need another hotel; do we need 2000 employees; what is occupancy rate of hotels we have currently; is there a need; what will happen if business fails; Continent was a unique shopping area and it is now empty; yes it's old but this will be old some day too; read long article about the book stores in Westerville; all are losing money because people are buying on internet and not going to store; relevant to us is that the movies at Stoneridge are possibly failing; company may be sold; restaurants have already failed; if movies go then more

restaurants will fail; these are almost new and people have moved on to Easton; we have this in another area of town; are we hurting ourselves by trying to strategize; will Gahanna be left with empty buildings downtown; also point out that concept plan says this will provide a unique niche and that it will complement not compete with other local shopping and development; have we determined what this unique niche is; have we determined how it will complement.

Chair asked for rebuttal. White stated public input as a whole was good; thank Hogan for statement we need to have plan; since November 1997 that's what Development Department has been working on; is not easy to get a plan where we have consensus; all these detailed questions we can't do until we get a concept plan in place; how much parking; is there a market; all these things; market study is old data now and do need to have that updated but for what; we need to deal with specific entities; are trying to come up with a plan to implement finding out specific information; look to see if a conference center would go in; to find out what those niche developments are; Continent was totally private; owners failed to reinvest to keep it up to development level it should have been; Stoneridge is in competition with other area; Gahanna is in competition; that's part of what we do; we have appointments with people from Plano TX to talk about Cinemark and what may happen; that's a Solove Casto private development; if they can't keep tenant mix up it does impact us but that's part of the private risk of development; are all here to be conservators of the public good; since 1997 tax revenue collection has almost doubled; done exceedingly well going from \$7 million to \$14 million; are other revenues that are not tax generating from our 1.5% tax; can utilize those funds; in the letter from San Antonio, City owns the water way including its banks, sidewalks and patios; leases some to adjoining businesses; market rate leases as determined by appraisals; San Antonio knows that it did not develop as a planned unit; some things developed; some, like the Alamo existed and encouraged development; 365 days of sun does make a difference; this is something different that no one else in this area is doing; use the water resource as part of the development; we are not mimicking; do we know parking garage needs to go there; no, we need to make that determination; if we don't make the commitment to this conceptual plan can't make those further investigations; need to begin to implement to get the detailed information when we do get all the market and feasibility studies; they will come to talk about parking garages and how they work and how much public support is needed; they called us; we are getting that kind of input; need to have consultants; need the details that you are asking for; are doing this for the people of Gahanna; we don't know how much parking we need; attempting to get the plan and then we can look to see what the plan will hold and sustain; McAllister said we don't want to speculate; we buy many public lands and are no prohibitions to buying land for development purposes particularly in areas of restoration; Dempsey has been cooperative; \$20 is for whole land mass area; divide areas and actual appraisal for all the land across the street; used that as a project for that \$20 per s.f.; does that come to what he wants; it may not; if we don't get a plan no reason for negotiation with landowners; Dineen is in an area that needs some services; looking at that; believe this Planning Commission, Council and citizenry won't let us develop something we can't support; as your Development Director won't support something we can't economically feasibly develop; lived up to that so far; is it good that this plan is grandiose; probably it is; when all is said and done will have a plan before you that will detail; that's why we retained local architect who is well trusted; why do we have 1 house on Walnut; is for EMH&T but started out as new home for Doll House; EMH&T won't rent and they needed to accommodate their offices to stay downtown; really happy with that; what plan do you have to follow; when finished with what may occur in downtown it will be a huge voluminous document so that we will have specific guidelines; won't be reduced to specific pieces; representation on the development and design guidelines; our working relationship has always been so that we can communicate and accomplish the best good

for this community; do need a plan; is this the best conceptual plan; probably not but is a plan we can say we like; enough at this point.

Thom stated a letter had been received from Tom Liszkay showing his opposition to the plan; his basis is the extension of the canal; is included in the permanent file.

Turley stated that the chart showing development team roles and responsibilities, don't see any landscape architects currently under contract. D'Ambrosio stated there were none currently but talked recently about hiring a landscape architect as consultant; idea came up in the teams and from different people. Turley stated she was glad to see it being addressed; wanted it on record; success of outdoor space is critical to the entire project; not as an afterthought but from the beginning to the end.

Greenblott stated she was intrigued with P. Peck's comment on surveying Gahanna residents; realize we have public meetings for people to come forward; as you can see by how many are here that doesn't always happen; wondering if the City has thought about surveying the residents. White stated that we did a survey last year; did one when we did the public hearing; survey instruments; idea for conference center came from residents because we don't have one in this community; need a meeting facility for weddings, graduations, anniversaries, business, and dance recitals; idea germinated from public; hotel has always been talked about; was in the original marketing study; always talked about as a potential for that particular area; always talked about residential; if Planning recommends and feels it is viable, it is fairly easy to do; survey our business district once a year and we could get a fairly good response back; if Council wants to do this we can proceed.

R. Peck stated this was a personal struggle; spent a lot of time dealing with 13 lots on issues that weren't before us; lot of input on that; some areas of this plan are within our responsibility; will have an impact on community and land use; aesthetics are involved; is a value on intangibles; those are all clearly areas we have a proper role; who pays for is not part of our element in the equation; when private developer comes in they pay for, go to bank, get loan and do; while appreciate the concerns voiced on how paid for and how money is spent, we don't spend public money; we don't authorize bonds; not an improvement district; not always clear what our role is but pretty sure what it's not; we don't spend a lot of money here; do have a concern that issues before us with density and aesthetics; need a starting point; this plan calls for 300,000 s.f. of commercial with 130,000 of unique retail along creek; 250,000 of new office; that's 550,000 s.f. of development; looking at land acquisition; looking at about 250,000 s.f. of land or in real terms the equivalent of 2 blocks from High to the end of the post office; if we have 500,000 s.f. on 250,000 s.f. of land and we want, as a community, to have a nice sizable chunk devoted to open space, think we need to make sure that community buys into this they know what they're buying; we are looking at 3 and 4 story buildings; looking at Mill Street and 1 level below present grade and creating a new ground level to preserve open space; need to recognize that; doing a disservice if we don't look at this impact on the existing thoroughfare plan even at minimal levels; if we think a couple of thousand cars a day are acceptable need to know how they get in and out; what does that do to existing 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. traffic from Bryn Mawr and that end of town; they may not be particularly involved until they can't get to Mill and Granville to get to I-670; those are issues we need to look at; what does this do to Carpenter if it is now a 2 lane street that is substandard; how do we stop people from going north on Ridenour; how do we stop them from going east on Carpenter; we can't just as we can't build 3 football fields with no way to get there; these are questions we can anticipate now to the extent we can accurately depict what the density is; or scale down version again and the impact on day to day lives; biggest concern was to do with density and just address issues we can right

now; know there are some we can't until details are there; how do we get them in and out.

Turley stated that the 300,000 s.f. and 2,000 employees are conceptual levels; when we get down to economic feasibility and traffic these figures may come down; if it won't work then numbers would go down. White agreed. Turley continued that this conceptual plan will need a traffic study down the road; if it say's this isn't going to work, then we are back to ground one somewhere and need to rethink what it is; economically even; to move forward at that point without public support would be suicide.

Thom stated that key words are conceptual plan; this is conceptual and not final; referred by Council to get public input and make some recommendations which will ultimately help to make that final decision; certainly sure there is going to be a lot of changes before we arrive at a final plan. White stated that with regard to the creek canal, am meeting on August 14 with all appropriate jurisdictions like ODOT and Franklin County; they may say you can't do; that ends that; doesn't mean we couldn't but concept of going under street will not occur.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 10:14 p.m.

Chair stated this item would be discussed in workshop at 6:45 p.m. on August 2.

Discussed

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DR-0036-2000

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a free standing, single face sign mounted to existing fence; property located at the corner of Cherry Bottom Road and Cherry Way Drive; Charles Penzone by The New Albany Company.

Mike Crommes, New Albany Company, 6525 West Campus Oval, Suite 100, New Albany, Ohio, stated he was showing two options for sign located at northwest corner of Cherrybottom and Cherry Way; first option shows existing horse fence stepping back 24' and then over 32' with single sided free standing sign which is the shop drawing of the design; is 15' back of right of way which is setback standard; landscape bed of ground cover and evergreen shrubs; also showing existing sidewalk and right of way; externally illuminated with mini quartz floodlight; about 4" square with telescopic cut off and no light spillover; will identify as option A; is one flood basically; second option mirrors what we discussed in relationship to Cherrybottom Medical Center; that existing sign is 30' back of right of way and 290' from existing sidewalk; option B is sign located on raised brick planter; would be double sided sign and satellite dish is almost next to raised planter in lower left hand corner; matches existing condition across street; horse fence would remain as is along Cherrybottom and terminating at sidewalk; would be taller to be more visible for southbound traffic along Cherrybottom.

Greenblott asked if Crommes had a preference. Crommes stated he preferred the second option because it mirrors the other side; also improves the southbound visibility for Penzone; first option is somewhat limited but if people slowed down it would be readable; a raised brick planter raises some issues in and among itself; professionally believe both would work; raised brick planter helps to anchor that entry and anchors the parcels into Cherrybottom.

Turley stated her concern is that it is so close to the building; literally just a couple of feet off the satellite dish.

Discussed

A motion was made by Mullin, seconded by Smith, to approve DR-0036-2000 for the northwest corner of Cherrybottom and Cherry Way for Charles Penzone as Option A and subject to approval of lighting by the Department of Development.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

G. NEW BUSINESS:

DR-0047-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow renovation of Hunters Ridge Mall, Glimcher Properties, applicant.

John Tyson, 2419 Arborview, Columbus, stated he was with Glimcher; apologize for putting the cart ahead of the horse; have done some painting already; did not realize color change would require the review; was just doing my maintenance job; intention is to paint entire center; understand from talking with Zoning that we will not get the 3 years originally requested, but if approved will have 1 year to complete; just painted it tan not too long ago but will paint gray within the next year if approved; hope you have had a chance to look at the K-Mart portion which is the new paint; that's the color that the rest of it will be; glad to answer any questions; hope submission speaks for itself.

Canter asked Tyson about the limit of his authority with Glimcher; previous administrative staff worked to get some market improvements and all we got was some striping; realize there is security guard also; have a long way to go; paint won't satisfy me and will have an opportunity at workshop next week to discuss; remember one item was landscape islands; not blaming you; this is an opportunity for us to get the mall to look better than it does; is a viable center; will do everything in my power for it not to become less than that; would like to see it more improved than a can of paint and landscape islands; is that within your jurisdiction. Tyson stated he was responsible for maintenance - roof repairs, striping, overlays in parking lot, security guards and that type of thing.

Thom asked if it would be possible to bring someone who could talk capital improvements for workshop next Wednesday at 6:30 p.m. Tyson stated he would try; will work with Development Department on that; . Thom stated we want to work with Glimcher and come to some resolution. Peck stated our normal procedure if there were any questions raised was to have a public hearing and refer the item to workshop for review and then vote the week following that.

Discussed

DR-0050-2000

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 90 Oak Creek Drive; Charles E. Jones, applicant.

Charles Jones, 5448 Briarbank Drive, stated he was here representing the Gahanna Oaks condominiums which begin at 90 Oak Creek Place; is a 38 unit complex and simply want to repair the existing sign; have the original package of the sign that was done in 1994; the Gahanna Community Church shared one half of the sign with the condos; several months ago they got another sign in front of the church and at that time they had to give up the other sign; simply want to move Gahanna Oaks to the front sign and have oak tree on the second sign so we can utilize the entire sign; the old sign was painted blue with blue markings; Gahanna Oaks are the colors submitted; just repaint in the existing colors that are Gahanna Oaks now; really that's the extent of it; simple refacing of what is there.

In response to question from Greenblott, Jones stated the sign was 5 years old now and

looks good; there is a light on each sign side that has been there since the beginning; will continue to maintain the landscaping around the sign as required by code.

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

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

SWP-0009-2000

To consider a Subdivision Without Plat application to split 8.566 acres into two buildable lots and to create a 0.135 acre right of way parcel.

White stated that applicant is requesting subdivision without plat to split recently zoned limited overlay suburban office land; was in their limited overlay plan; split to a 4.088 acre parcel and one of 4.222 acres; last split is 0.135 acre of right of way in the front of the parcel.

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

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee of the Whole: No Report.

C.I.C.: No Report.

Creekside Development Team: No Report.

Olde Gahanna Design Review Committee: No Report.

Sign Code Committee: No Report.

I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

City Engineer.

Komlanc stated that we have limited copies of the Hamilton Road Traffic Study available; Thoroughfare Plan is under way; should have numbers next week; at planning stage put in for accommodations for Creekside however need to know type of development before they can apply to the model; does cover parking spaces etc. that is part of the Thoroughfare Plan.

Chair.

For the Sign Code Committee, suggest you take a look at the service station in Worthington across from the Hilton at Wilson Bridge; actually use carved wood sign to advertise their price changes; is their main sign; looks very well; will send an intern to get picture; note that Amoco and BP will change their signage again.

D'Ambrosio introduced Shawn Leiningar; graduate student at OSU earning Masters in Planning; is our second intern and will be attending every other meeting.

J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS

SWP-0008-2000

Subdivision Without Plat to correct a previous lot split; no new lots created; approved by Zoning Administrator on July 11, 2000.

Clerk advised of Zoning Administrator approval of SWP-0008-2000 for Canini &

Pellecchia, Inc., for right of way drop on East Johnstown Road in front of Stoney Memorial Animal Hospital.

Received and Filed

K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.

Greenblott asked about Wingate Inn we approved a while ago; is it by same developer as Holiday Inn; do we have a problem with that also. Clerk stated the approval was over a year old and building did not commence; is a moot point; will have to start over with that site.

Mullin questioned how we can do Creekside with 600 parking spaces and it takes 800 for football.

L. ADJOURNMENT: 10:45 p.m.

Motion by Smith, seconded by Mullin.

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC/AAE
Clerk of Council

Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC
Clerk of Council

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

Chair Signature