

# **City of Gahanna**

*200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, February 27, 2002**

**7:00 PM**

**City Hall**

## **Planning Commission**

*Richard A. Peck, Chair*

*Jane Turley, Vice Chair*

*Cynthia G. Canter*

*Candace Greenblott*

*P. Frank O'Hare*

*Donald R. Shepherd*

*Othelda A. Spencer*

*Tanya M. Word, Deputy Clerk of Council*

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

Gahanna Planning Commission met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 South Hamilton Road, Gahanna, Ohio on Wednesday, February 27, 2002. The agenda for this meeting was published on February 21, 2002. Chair Richard A. Peck called the meeting to order at 7:08 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Planning Commission member, Donald Shepherd.

**Members Absent:** Jane Turley

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

**B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA - None**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 13, 2002**

A motion was made, seconded by Greenblott, to approve the minutes of February 13, 2002. The motion carried by the following vote:

<b>Yes</b>	<b>3</b>	Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
<b>Absent</b>	<b>1</b>	Vice Chairman Turley

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

**E. APPLICATIONS:**

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

**FDP-0001-2002**

To consider a Final Development Plan for SUT USA, Inc.; to be located at 625 Cross Pointe Road; SUT USA, Inc. by Dublin Building Systems, Christopher P. John, applicant. (Public Hearing. Advertised in RFE on 02/07/02). (Public Hearing held on 2/13/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:10 P.M.

Richard Ireland, representative from Dublin Building Systems, 10555 Stonham Drive, Powell, OH, stated that he is here to receive approval of the Final Development Plan; was unable to be in attendance at the first meeting with the Commission; understand that one of the main concerns was increasing the landscaping along Cross Pointe Road; what we did was increase the landscaping by 50%; added two Evergreen trees and two additional Deciduous trees; think it was discussed to triple the landscaping which would mean increasing the landscaping by about 300%, we felt that was a little excessive; my client elected to landscape in front of the proposed addition of the undeveloped half of the site, so that the trees and everything would grow at the same rate; making it look uniform across the front. Greenblott asked how many trees were on the last plan. Ireland replied there were two Evergreens and two Deciduous. Spencer commented one of the things that was discussed in workshop was the types of trees and types of material used because the Commission would like to see more color in the landscaping; from what you are presenting this evening, it looks as though you are adding more of what was in the previous landscape plan. Ireland stated that the Deciduous type trees what we added were red maple which do add color; originally we had two red maples in the front; one on each end; the other tree was a honey locust tree. Greenblott commented that the honey locust tree is not a particularly pretty tree. Ireland stated there is a total of four

red maples; two on each end to balance it off; then obviously the Evergreens are green in color. Canter commented one of the points that the Commission made at workshop in anticipating the revised plan was the fact that the Commission wanted some color and some interest; if you could add some bed planting to give it a little more interest. Ireland replied that it might have been misinterpreted to triple the trees. Greenblott stated that the Commission asked to triple the landscaping; that might mean bringing in some bed planting some grasses; some day lilies, etc.; something that has some color. Ireland commented we do have a bed around the sign; we could increase the bed around the sign; appreciate the comment that Canter stated about maybe exchanging trees for beds and planting. Canter replied like you have two trees at the entry way; that's generally where the planting beds with the grasses and the day lilies have their big focal point. Ireland stated we could do more beds and plantings in lieu of one or two trees; we could even do some mounding perhaps about two feet. Spencer replied that is a good idea.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:21 P.M.

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

- Yes**        **3**     Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
- Absent**    **1**     Vice Chairman Turley

**DR-0008-2002**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 625 Cross Pointe Road; SUT USA, Inc. by Dublin Building Systems, Christopher P. John, applicant.

See discussion on previous application.

**Discussed**

**A motion was made, seconded by O'Hare, that this matter be Approved with the following condition: the revised landscape plan which is to be received in the Council office include: (1) the addition of mounding and planting beds; (2) the deletion of the two honey locust trees from the plan submitted on 2/27/02; keeping the two maples trees. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Yes**        **3**     Chairman Peck, O'Hare and Greenblott
- Absent**    **1**     Vice Chairman Turley

**S-0001-2002**

To consider the Olde Gahanna Design Guidelines dated 02/27/2002; to obtain public input for recommendation to Council for adoption of said plan.(Advertised in the RFE on 02/14/02 and 02/21/02). (Public Hearing held on 2/27/02, 3/13/02).

Chair opened Public Hearing at 7:29 P.M.

William Murdock, City of Gahanna, Department of Development, 200 S. Hamilton Road; stated the Design Guidelines Team is comprised of the Development Director, the Zoning Administrator, an Architect, a Planning Commission member, a Planning Intern, a Landscape Architect, a Development Intern, and a Planner; what we are submitting this evening is the Olde Gahanna Designs guidelines along with recommending code changes that match the document; the objective of the Olde Gahanna Design Guidelines is to encourage and direct a form of development and redevelopment that will achieve the physical qualities necessary to maintain and enhance Olde Gahanna's economic

vitality and it's unique character in Central Ohio; in keeping with this main objective, this document endeavors to set forth innovative, reasonable design guidelines that (1) coordinate development & redevelopment; (2) emphasize its community focus; (3) use design to enhance Gahanna's identity; (4) seamlessly integrate Creekside into Olde Gahanna; the document consists of five different chapters; Chapter 1 is the introduction which consists of the introduction; the history of Olde Gahanna, the description of Olde Gahanna, and the current state of the area; Chapter 2 is Process, which discusses zoning classifications, Planning Commission, the Design Review Process, and a sample copy of the Design Review Application; Chapter 3 is Planning/Design and discusses Planning, Purpose, and Objectives; Criteria for Project Evaluation, and Elements of Design; Chapter 4 is Design Examples which consists of Building Design, Exterior Space Design, and Design Examples; Chapter 5 is the Recommendations Chapter and is broken into two sections; the first is Buildings which discusses Building Facades, Building Materials, Awnings, Menu Boards, Light and Bollards, and Signage; the second section is Exterior Spaces which covers Public Space & Landscaping, Urban Trees, Tree Wells, Fences, Landscape Maintenance, Parking & Screening, and Water Features; the final part of the guidelines is the appendix which includes maps and diagrams; along with this, we are submitting several code changes to 1150 and 1197, to bring the codes which govern design in Olde Gahanna in accordance with this document.

Chair asked for Opponents. There were none.

Chair closed Public Hearing at 7:37 P.M.

Chair advised this application will be taken to workshop on 3/6/02 at 6:15 P.M.

O' Hare asked Murdock if he could fill out a draft/sample copy of the DR application for workshop, so that the Commission can see what type of information you are thinking about putting in there. Murdock replied that he would have a completed sample.

**Discussed**

## **F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

### **DR-0011-2002**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness; for property located at 60 Stygler Road; CVS by Cicogna Sign Co., Russ Frain, Jr., applicant.

Bill Burgess, 6277 Slater Road E., Andover, OH., stated he was not familiar with what was going on; needs to know what changes were asked for by the Commission; has two different plans with him this evening. Peck asked to what plans he had with him; basically the Commission had two problems; (1) the awning; (2) color and capacity of the ground sign. Spencer commented that the Commission had requested they change the font size. Burgess distributed the diagrams he brought with him, explaining that one diagram has a font size of 36; while the other has a font size of 30. Burgess stated that the monument size is white facing with the CVS logo in a dark color. Peck stated that the Commission asked if that could be reversed to a Red opaque background with white lettering, the Commission was informed that this was not an unusual request and that it could be done. Spencer advised that it is hard to make a decision without seeing a color rendering of the design layout. Peck stated that the Commission has enough concerns with this sign package, thinks that the application should be brought back to the Commission in two weeks; asked the applicant to be come at 6:30 P.M. on Wednesday, March 13th before to review the application before the Public Hearing meeting; the awning with CVS/pharmacy looks a lot cleaner. Canter stated that she likes the 30 inch font. Peck and Shepherd concurred with Canter.

**Discussed**

**G. NEW BUSINESS:**

**DR-0013-2002**

To consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage; for property located at 306A West Johnstown Road; JR Management Group, LLC by Sign-A-Rama, Franklin P. Zura, applicant.

Frank P. Zura, 54 Granville Street, stated this request for Appropriateness for Signage is a second request subsequent to the prior request earlier this month; the applicant/owner of the property has decided to take an option of going to a smaller sign first, then wait until after the installation of the new widening of Johnstown Road; he is afraid that he is going to put a lot of money in the sign; this is basically a request to at least upgrade the signs; if you notice in the photographs, we tried to give the Commission a complete photograph of the actual frontage of the apartment complex itself; you will notice that there are two red signs; one at the extreme right (this is the photograph of the current sign) which would be to the east end of the property; there is a sign at the west end; what the applicant is currently requesting is to put a new sign at the west end because that is closet to where the rental office is, and to be able to remove the current sign on the west end and install the new sign which would not require a variance because we would be at least 17' - 20' off the right of way. Canter remarked that the timing would be that after the roadway is widened you would want to put the monument sign in at that time. Zura commented that the applicant would like to have the opportunity to weigh that option at that time. Canter replied so the eastern most sign will remain. Zura replied that we have discussed that; my feeling on that is the sign at the other end is a white sign; if we are going to have green on one end, then we should have green on the other; the property is broken up into two separate parcels, so if we go for the second sign on the east side according to what is on West Johnstown Road according to our plots and our maps, we would have to go after another sign request for the second sign. D'Ambrosio stated that this application needs to be taken to workshop and further discussed; we have a couple of issues to work out, on the original variance application, the eastern sign was going to be removed, along with several other issues. Canter asked King if a property owner has multiple parcels for the same project, is he entitled to a sign for every single parcel in that project. King replied the apartment complex might consist of three parcels, four parcels, etc., but it's one complex and it ought to be treated as one complex; would need to research it further.

Peck stated this application will be taken to workshop on March 6th at 6:30 P.M.

**Discussed**

**H. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**Committee of the Whole**

**Gahanna Jefferson Joint Committee - Canter - No Report**

**Creekside Development Team - Greenblott.**

Greenblott stated that the team met today; the Commission will be seeing Phase I for the Public Infrastructure at the March 20th workshop of Planning Commission; O'Brien invited the Planning Commission to the Committee of the Whole meeting of Council on March 11th to see the plans.

**I. OFFICIAL REPORTS:**

**City Attorney - No Report**

**City Engineer - No Report**

**Department of Development - No Report**

**Chair.**

Chair stated that the Commission had a very involved meeting with St. Matthew's; will be meeting with St. Matthew's next week in workshop.

**J. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS - None**

**K. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

Peck thanked the government students for their attendance.

**L. ADJOURNMENT - 8:02 P.M.**

---

**TANYA M. WORD**  
**Deputy Clerk of Council**

---

**Isobel L. Sherwood, MMC**  
**Clerk of Council**

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

---

**Chair Signature**